

BLUE WAVES

A commentary on Bahujan ideology



Dr. Marlapudi Vijay Chandra

Blue Waves

A commentary on Bahujan ideology

Dr. Marlapudi Vijay Chandra

Dr. BR Ambedkar 135 Birth Day Special

ISBN

978-93-7151-449-1

Free eBook

Roshan Publications

Visalkapatnam

roshanpublications@gmail.com

Mobile: 9493159482

Foreword

From the tender years of childhood through the formative passages of youth, I was nurtured in the belief that the Indian National Congress was not merely a political party, but the Party of Dalits, for Dalits and by Dalits—indeed, our own. In the course of my political journey, I was afforded the opportunity to serve within the research division of the Congress Party, an experience that shaped both my intellectual and ideological bearings. The party's steadfast commitment to secularism, its adherence to socialist thought, and its enduring vision of social justice left a lasting impression upon me. Above all, the leadership of Rahul Gandhi—particularly his consistent emphasis on Bahujan concerns—deeply influenced my convictions. His resolute articulation of the principle “Jitna Abadi Utna Haq,” asserting that rights must correspond to population, and his solemn promise of social, economic, and political justice for all during the Bharat Jodo Nyay Yatra, stirred within me the resolve to undertake this intellectual and political endeavor. Under his leadership, this slogan has emerged not as a mere liberal expression of inclusion, nor as an instrument of integration, but as a foundational doctrine of the Congress Party.

Under the stewardship of our first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, the guiding principles of “Unity in Diversity” and “Continuity and Change” were not abstract ideals, but living realities embedded within governance. Through the establishment of constitutional rule, pathways were opened toward political, economic,

and social justice. The introduction of Five-Year Plans, the construction of multipurpose irrigation projects, and the transformation of barren lands into fertile fields reshaped the agrarian landscape. Industrialization was pursued with vigor, enhancing productivity and fostering economic growth. The Green Revolution secured food self-sufficiency, while institutions of excellence such as the IITs and IIMs were founded to cultivate intellectual capital of global stature. Investments in education and healthcare elevated the quality of life, increasing life expectancy and strengthening the social fabric. Scientific and technological advancements, including space exploration and satellite launches, placed India on the world stage, while nuclear capabilities fortified national security. The integration of princely states, nationalization of banks, abolition of monarchy and zamindari systems, and the redistribution of land to the landless marked decisive steps toward structural reform. Public welfare measures ensured food, shelter, and dignity for the marginalized, while landmark legislations—such as the Right to Education, the Food Security Act, and the Right to Information—expanded the horizons of democratic empowerment. These transformative efforts, taken together, reflect a consistent commitment to Bahujan empowerment that guided the Congress leadership in shaping the nation's destiny.

Historically, upper castes occupied positions of priesthood, rulership, landownership, and commerce, thereby exercising sustained dominance over the social, economic, and political spheres. In time, ruling castes aligned with them, consolidating power into a

formidable and enduring structure. This caste-dominant power structure, operating both overtly and covertly, has played a decisive role within political parties across the nation. It has sought to impose, through various stratagems, a framework rooted in Hindutva, feudalism, capitalism, and upper-caste dominance. Contemporary political realities reveal that this structure exerts influence over nearly all political formations, often directing them as if by remote control—even extending to parties that claim to represent the common people. At critical junctures, it assumes a unified form, asserting control over institutions, systems, and the broader political order.

In the present moment, the convergence of religious orthodoxy, capitalist expansion, feudal remnants, and Hindutva ideology has eroded the foundational roots of socialist thought. This nexus exploits Bahujans, deepens agrarian distress, and drives farmers toward despair. It diverts unemployed youth into the currents of religious extremism, weakens the pillars of education and healthcare, distorts historical narratives, and intensifies repression against Dalit-Bahujan minorities. The erosion of judicial credibility and the perpetuation of a flawed electoral system further undermine democratic integrity. Hatred, though never a just or sustainable path, increasingly appears as a defining feature of this entrenched power structure. In response, there are instances where Bahujans, united by shared grievances, rise in resistance against dominant castes. Yet the spiral of violence and counter-violence, of hatred met with hatred, offers no enduring resolution. The imperative,

therefore, is not to perpetuate this cycle, but to dismantle the caste-dominant power structure and its economic backbone in capitalism, and to envision the establishment of a scientific socialist state grounded in justice for all.

Having carefully examined the writings of Bahujan thinkers, the organizations and political movements established in the names of Phule, Ambedkar, and Kanshi Ram, and the efforts of leaders striving to sustain Bahujan Ideology and collective consciousness, I was compelled to undertake a reflective inquiry. This work seeks to explore the foundational principles, evolving awareness, emotional currents, deeply held beliefs, and the pressing challenges faced by the Bahujans, while also contemplating pathways toward resolution. Drawing upon the intellectual journeys of key Bahujan leaders and engaging with diverse streams of thought, I present this concise yet earnest commentary on the essence of Bahujan Ideology. My foremost objective is to stimulate critical reflection within the ranks of Bahujan leadership. It is natural that some may disagree with my perspectives; such dissent is both legitimate and welcome.

It is necessary to clarify that this commentary does not indiscriminately categorize all individuals belonging to upper castes. Not all are opposed to political, economic, and social justice. Within these communities exist individuals of integrity, reformist spirit, and progressive vision—many of whom I have encountered over the course of my two-decade-long political journey. In this

context, the terms upper castes, dominant castes, and caste-dominant power structure are employed specifically to denote those who actively obstruct justice and constitutional rights. This distinction must be clearly understood by the broader society.

Revolutionary politics does not seek power for its own sake; rather, it aspires to transform the very nature of power. Though political parties may differ in form and strategy, the ultimate goal remains singular: the creation of an egalitarian, developed, and harmonious society free from structural inequalities. It is my earnest hope that this modest commentary may serve as a guiding light for Bahujan leaders in shaping their responsibilities and direction. With a spirit of humility and conviction, I extend an invitation to a transformative movement for political, economic, and social justice, echoing the call—“Jitna Abadi Utna Haq.”

Be love,

Dr. Marlapudi Vijay Chandra
Visakhapatnam
14 April 2026

1. The Fundamental Problem

The term “Bahujans” is derived from ancient Sanskrit, where “*bahu*” denotes “many” and “*jana*” signifies “people.” In its literal sense, therefore, it refers to “the many” or “the common masses.” The expression appears prominently in early Buddhist literature, particularly in the teachings of Gautama Buddha, who proclaimed “*Bahujana hitaya, bahujana sukhaya*”—for the welfare and happiness of the many—thereby invoking the collective good of society at large.

Over time, this term acquired a distinct socio-political connotation within the Indian context. Jyotirao Phule first articulated this idea in a structured manner, highlighting the condition of the oppressed majority. B. R. Ambedkar expanded its philosophical and constitutional dimensions, while Kanshi Ram translated it into a coherent political movement. In its contemporary usage, “Bahujans” encompasses Dalits, Adivasis, Other Backward Classes, and religious minorities—communities that, despite constituting the numerical majority, have historically remained marginalized from structures of

power. Thus, the term has evolved from a descriptive category into a transformative ideological construct.

The concept of the Bahujan, meaning the majority, was powerfully advanced by Jyotirao Phule. He argued that Indian society is inherently unequal, structured upon hierarchical divisions rather than principles of justice. The Shudras, Ati-Shudras, and other marginalized communities form the foundational base of the nation, yet they have long been denied dignity, voice, and control over their socio-economic conditions. Phule's intervention was not limited to reform; it marked the beginning of a deeper awakening rooted in self-respect and social consciousness.

B. R. Ambedkar further developed this framework by asserting that political democracy cannot be sustained without the foundations of social and economic equality. His call to "Educate, Organize, Agitate" was not merely rhetorical but constituted a strategic roadmap for empowerment. He emphasized that marginalized communities must transcend dependency and assume agency in shaping their own destinies. Historical movements such as the Mahad Satyagraha exemplify

this transition from passive demand for rights to active assertion and acquisition of those rights.

In the subsequent phase, Kanshi Ram institutionalized these ideas within the domain of electoral politics. He transformed dispersed social consciousness into an organized political force, with the explicit objective of converting numerical strength into political power. His vision underscored that the majority must not remain peripheral actors in history but must emerge as its principal authors.

A core principle embedded within Bahujan Ideology is that representation should be proportionate to population. However, empirical realities reveal a stark divergence from this ideal. In the state of Andhra Pradesh, for instance, the ruling castes—Kamma and Reddy—constitute approximately 8% of the population and, by proportional standards, should occupy around 14 legislative seats; yet they hold 67. In contrast, Backward Classes, comprising about 52% of the population, are entitled to approximately 87 seats but hold only 40. Similarly, Muslims, constituting around 8%, should have about 14 seats

but possess only 3, while Kshatriyas, representing roughly 0.5% of the population, hold 7 seats instead of the proportionate 1.

Such disparities raise critical questions regarding the distribution of representation across political institutions, governance, judiciary, media, and economic sectors. What structural forces sustain this imbalance? How can equitable representation be achieved? What strategies must the Bahujans adopt to secure political, social, and economic justice? These questions necessitate a rigorous analysis through the intellectual frameworks developed by Phule, Ambedkar, and Kanshi Ram.

Casteism refers to the systematic division of society into hierarchical groups based on caste, wherein one group is accorded superiority over others, and access to rights, opportunities, and social dignity is distributed accordingly. It is not merely a social classification but an institutionalized mechanism that undermines the fundamental principle of human equality by assigning status and occupation based on birth. Historically rooted in the evolution of social and religious traditions, this system gradually hardened into a rigid structure that prioritizes inherited identity over individual merit. The

consolidation of power by Dominant castes has further entrenched this hierarchy, rendering it resistant to transformation.

In the Indian context, Casteism has been a persistent source of inequality for centuries. Reformers such as B. R. Ambedkar mounted a sustained and unequivocal critique of this system, advocating for a society founded on justice, equality, and human dignity. Where Casteism prevails, caste identity eclipses individual worth; in its absence, individuals are evaluated on the basis of their abilities, labor, and ideas. Therefore, a critical understanding of Casteism is not merely an academic exercise but an essential step toward the realization of an egalitarian social order.

At a fundamental level, questions such as why Dalits are denied entry into Hindu temples, or why Dalit Bahujans are unable to serve as priests in major places of worship, belong to the social domain. Similarly, the persistent inability of Bahujans to secure political representation in proportion to their population raises critical political concerns. Why do ruling castes predominantly select candidates from within their own caste groups for

positions of authority? Why are members of the backward classes compelled to compete within the general category, rather than being allotted representation based on demographic proportion? Why do the structures of power and the judiciary remain largely controlled by dominant castes? Why have Bahujans not been able to achieve economic parity with upper castes? Why are land, commerce, resources, and wealth overwhelmingly concentrated in the hands of upper castes? Why have comprehensive land reforms not been reintroduced at a national level? And why do certain political parties align themselves submissively with a capitalist system that extracts and concentrates the nation's resources? These are fundamentally political and economic questions. The discontent and emotional intensity felt by Bahujans in response to these conditions are articulated within the framework of Bahujan Ideology.

A significant portion of the Bahujan population continues to seek both material and spiritual advancement within the framework of Hindu religious belief. At the same time, they are compelled to engage in continuous struggle for economic, political, and social justice. In this context, Bahujan Ideology

provides a framework for addressing the foundational problems created by the caste system and suggests pathways toward their resolution.

Although Casteism has, for centuries, shaped the everyday lived experiences of millions of Bahujans, it has seldom been explicitly defined—largely because its presence has been normalized within society. Casteism may be understood as a system in which decisions and policies are formulated on the basis of caste, with the intention of maintaining certain groups in a subordinated position and ensuring continued control over them. This approach has historically been adopted by dominant castes in their relations with Bahujans, and it continues to function in both overt and subtle forms.

Caste discrimination operates in two interconnected dimensions: individual and institutional. Individual caste discrimination refers to direct acts of violence or exclusion perpetrated by individuals or groups belonging to dominant castes against Bahujan individuals. These acts include murder, physical assault, sexual violence, forced tonsuring, social boycotts, honor killings, and other degrading practices such as forcing

individuals to consume urine or excreta, parading them naked, or attacking their religious beliefs. Such acts are visible, explicit, and often documented.

Institutional caste discrimination, by contrast, is less visible but equally, if not more, pervasive in its effects. It emerges from the routine functioning of established and socially sanctioned systems, including political ideologies, legislative actions, judicial decisions, executive policies, and the broader orientation of governance structures. It is further reinforced by the narratives propagated through mass media aligned with capitalist interests. Because these forms of discrimination are embedded within systems rather than enacted by identifiable individuals, they are difficult to document and often escape widespread public scrutiny, even though they have profound and lasting consequences on the lives of Bahujans.

Both individual and institutional forms of caste discrimination are sustained by underlying ideological forces. The eradication of these forms of oppression requires the effective implementation of the principles of economic, political, and

social justice as enshrined in the Constitution, aimed at the welfare of all sections of society.

For instance, when caste-based violence occurs—such as attacks carried out under pretexts like those witnessed in Una—it represents a clear case of individual caste discrimination, which often attracts public condemnation. However, when, within the same societal context, thousands of Bahujan children die annually due to lack of access to adequate nutrition, housing, education, and healthcare, and when large sections of the Bahujan population continue to suffer systemic deprivation and marginalization, these outcomes must be understood as manifestations of institutional caste discrimination.

Likewise, when a Dalit family is denied rental housing in an upper-caste locality, it constitutes a direct and identifiable act of individual caste discrimination—an injustice that is frequently acknowledged, at least rhetorically, by society.

The confinement of the Bahujans to broken-down and unsanitary localities, such as slums and congested settlements, and the prescription that they subsist within narrow dwellings on scanty one cent of land, is a direct manifestation of institutional

caste discrimination. Under the guise of welfare, the distribution of limited quantities of food grains and the occasional transfer of small sums into their accounts serve as instruments of electoral manipulation. Political parties, functioning as custodians of such exploitative practices, appropriate the votes of the Bahujans, while legislators and Members of Parliament operate as political entrepreneurs—dispensing money and liquor during elections, only to accumulate far greater wealth over their tenure. This cycle is sustained by a Caste dominant power structure, within which the Bahujans are subjected to continuous exploitation.

In response to this entrenched condition, leadership has articulated a substantive and corrective framework: the principle of proportionate representation, ensuring that all castes receive equitable participation in political, economic, and social spheres in accordance with their population.

The 1950 Presidential Ordinance, which denies Scheduled Caste status to Dalit Christians, falls into this very category. It needs to be viewed as a form of institutionalized caste discrimination and institutionalized religious discrimination.

Institutional caste discrimination derives its strength from the persistent and widespread operation of anti-Bahujan attitudes and practices. The feudal, capitalist, and caste-dominant political order—aligned with and financially supportive of Hindutva organizations, caste supremacist elements, and forces that reinforce the caste system—has thus emerged as a structural impediment to Bahujan advancement. Within the Dominant castes, a deeply embedded consciousness of superiority prevails, wherein upper castes are regarded as inherently more capable and superior to the Bahujans. This belief is often justified through the invocation of Sanatana Dharma, interpreted as an eternal and unchanging order, thereby legitimizing the notion that the Bahujans must remain perpetually subordinate.

Such a framework of discrimination extends across all levels of society, from individual interactions to institutional arrangements, operating both overtly and covertly. Notably, certain proponents of caste supremacy evade direct culpability by refraining from overt acts of violence or discrimination; however, they continue to extend ideological, political, and material support to organizations such as the RSS and Bajrang Dal. These organizations function as vehicles for the

perpetuation of institutional caste discrimination, enforcing hierarchical social relations and constraining the Bahujans within the ideological confines of Hindutva, thereby obstructing their access to genuine development and redirecting state power toward the interests of capital.

Consequently, while isolated acts of individual discrimination may not fully encapsulate the structural realities of society, institutional caste discrimination provides a more accurate reflection of systemic inequality. A significant limitation within sections of Bahujan leadership lies in the disproportionate emphasis on individual instances of injustice, often at the expense of addressing systemic and institutionalized forms of oppression. It is therefore imperative that Bahujan leadership adopt a comprehensive and strategic approach to counter both dimensions of discrimination.

Across all regions of India—north, south, east, and west—the pervasive influence of caste discrimination has resulted in a deeply fragmented social order. The contemporary condition of caste relations, marked by both its intensity and its normalization, generates profound anxiety among the Bahujans.

Their distress arises not solely from the denial of political, economic, and social justice, but also from the disruption of their psychological well-being and the impediments placed upon their advancement.

In formal terms, although the Bahujans are recognized as equal citizens under the law, endowed with the same constitutional rights as others, their lived experiences within a society dominated by the Dominant castes reveal a persistent condition akin to second-class citizenship. The prevailing patterns of caste relations serve as empirical evidence of this contradiction.

To effectively address this condition, Bahujan Ideology—fundamentally opposed to both caste discrimination and the caste system—must be internalized and actively embraced. The principle of “Jitna Abadi, Utna Haq,” advocating for rights in proportion to population, must serve as a guiding framework for both thought and action. Despite the existence of a Constitution that guarantees equality, despite their status as citizens of their own nation, and despite their shared habitation of the same land alongside the ruling castes and upper castes, the continued subordination of the Bahujans raises fundamental questions of

justice. Can the persistence of caste-based inequality and oppression be reconciled with the principles of citizenship and constitutional equality? For how long are the Bahujans expected to endure such systemic injustice? Bahujan Ideology emerges as a comprehensive response to these enduring questions.

2. Caste-Centric Conflicts in Indian Society

Indian society has long been structured by a complex and hierarchical caste order, within which notions of caste centric honour, status, and occupational identity have historically governed social relations. The tensions observed between communities such as the Yadavs and Brahmins must be understood not as isolated disputes, but as manifestations of deeper socio-cultural and political processes embedded within this structure. Indeed, such conflicts are not confined to any single pair of castes; rather, they recur across regions in varying forms, often involving Brahmins and a wide range of other communities. At their core, these tensions are frequently associated with the Brahmanical emphasis on Vedic authority and ritual orthodoxy, which has historically functioned as a central axis of social differentiation. While shaped by regional variations in economic development and social prestige, these conflicts often display striking structural similarities across the subcontinent.

In North India, particularly in states such as Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, and Rajasthan, the tensions between Jats and Brahmins

provide a notable illustration. The Jats, traditionally an agrarian and martial community, derived their identity from landownership and military traditions. Over time, this identity brought them into contestation with Brahmanical authority. Since at least the eighteenth century, the Jats asserted their political prominence, most notably under Maharaja Suraj Mal, who established the Kingdom of Bharatpur. The Jats increasingly identified themselves as Kshatriyas, in contrast to their classification as Shudras within the Brahmanical order. This divergence generated enduring tensions, particularly as Brahmins emphasized ritual supremacy and social hierarchy. Reform movements such as the Arya Samaj further altered this dynamic by reducing reliance on Brahmins for ritual practices, thereby strengthening Jat self-respect and autonomy.

In Western India, especially in Maharashtra, the historical conflict between Marathas and Brahmins offers another significant example. During the coronation of Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj, the Brahmin scholar Gagabhat formally recognized him as a Kshatriya, highlighting the mediatory role of Brahmins in conferring social legitimacy. Subsequent developments under Shahu Maharaj I saw the rise of the

Peshwas—Brahmin administrators such as Balaji Vishwanath and Bajirao I—whose authority eventually expanded into political dominance. These evolving power relations produced complex tensions within Maratha society. Later, social reformers like Jyotirao Phule challenged the ideological foundations of caste hierarchy, intensifying anti-Brahmin sentiment and fostering new forms of social critique.

In South India, the Lingayat movement, founded by Basavanna, represented a direct ideological challenge to Brahminism by rejecting Vedic ritualism, caste distinctions, and priestly mediation. Similarly, in Kerala, the rigid dominance of Nambudiri Brahmins provoked reform movements led by Sri Narayana Guru, who emphasized equality and social justice. The Vaikom Satyagraha stands as a landmark struggle against caste-based exclusion. In Tamil Nadu, the anti-Brahmin movement led by Periyar E. V. Ramasamy challenged Brahmin dominance in education, employment, and culture, laying the foundation for political formations such as the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam.

Among all such struggles, the conflict involving Dalit communities represents perhaps the most profound, rooted in centuries of exclusion, untouchability, and denial of basic rights. The intellectual and political leadership of B. R. Ambedkar fundamentally transformed this struggle, embedding principles of equality, dignity, and justice within the constitutional framework of modern India.

These conflicts have typically arisen from contests over social status, access to resources, control of knowledge, and the right to self-definition. As communities advanced economically and politically—particularly through agriculture, trade, education, and labour—they increasingly challenged the legitimacy of a hierarchical order that subordinated them. The expansion of education, democratic participation, and reform movements accelerated processes of self-assertion, often intensifying tensions whenever inequalities became stark or aspirations for mobility grew.

The tensions between Yadavs and Brahmins must therefore be situated within this broader historical continuum. From the Jats of North India to the Lingayats of the South, and from the

Marathas of the West to Dalit movements across the country, these struggles reflect enduring negotiations over power, dignity, and justice. The Yadav–Brahmin dynamic, in particular, is not the product of a singular conflict but the outcome of a long historical evolution shaped by mythology, social hierarchy, and modern political processes.

Mythological narratives, such as those found in the Mahabharata, portray a dual structure of authority: the ritual authority of Brahmins and the political or martial authority of Kshatriyas, including the Yadavas. Figures like Krishna embody political wisdom, while Brahmins represent custodians of knowledge. Though not inherently antagonistic, this duality established a framework later interpreted as a source of tension. Similarly, the legend of Parashurama symbolically reflects conflicts between priestly and warrior classes.

Within the social structure, Brahmins traditionally occupied the highest status, controlling ritual, education, and normative authority, while Yadavas were associated with pastoral and agrarian occupations. Their ambiguous classification—alternatively as Shudras or Kshatriyas—generated contestation,

particularly as Yadavas sought upward mobility and recognition. This struggle often revolved around the authority to define social identity itself.

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, processes such as Sanskritization and self-respect movements intensified these dynamics. Yadav communities mobilized, pursued education, and asserted descent from the lineage of Krishna, thereby challenging Brahmanical authority. Under British colonial rule, caste censuses further transformed these assertions into organized struggles for recognition, with associations such as the Yadav Mahasabha advocating for Kshatriya status.

In the post-independence era, these dynamics entered the domain of democratic politics. As a significant component of the Other Backward Classes (OBCs), Yadavs emerged as an influential political constituency. Leaders such as Mulayam Singh Yadav and Lalu Prasad Yadav mobilized this identity within frameworks of social justice and representation, often positioning Brahmins as part of the traditional elite.

In the Telugu-speaking regions—namely Andhra Pradesh and Telangana—caste relations evolved along distinct lines. Brahmins historically exercised spiritual and intellectual authority, while agrarian castes such as Reddys, Kammas, and Velamas commanded economic and political power. Over time, particularly after independence, these agrarian groups translated their material dominance into political influence, leading to a gradual decline in Brahminical authority without necessarily producing direct ideological confrontation.

The Yadavas (Gollas and Kurumas), traditionally pastoral communities, experienced a different trajectory. Their assertion of higher social status—rooted in cultural and mythological associations with Krishna—generated tensions with Brahmanical classifications. This was less a struggle for economic parity than a quest for recognition and dignity within the social hierarchy. Temples and religious institutions, historically controlled by Brahmins, reinforced this paradox: while Yadavas claimed spiritual lineage, their social status remained subordinate.

In contemporary Andhra Pradesh and Telangana, however, relations between Yadavs and Brahmins are largely pragmatic and peaceful, with no widespread organized conflict. Instead, the most intense tensions have historically involved Dalit communities, whose struggles—shaped by the legacy of exclusion—continue to challenge both Brahmanical and dominant caste structures. Backward Classes and other emerging groups have also played a crucial role in reshaping the social order through demands for representation and equity.

Taken together, these developments demonstrate that caste relations in India cannot be reduced to a single axis of division. The decline of traditional Brahmin dominance, the rise of economically and politically powerful castes, and the growing assertion of marginalized communities have produced new and shifting configurations of conflict. Increasingly, the most visible tensions arise not between Brahmins and others, but between dominant castes and those striving for inclusion and justice.

Brahmins are frequently perceived as central actors in caste-related conflicts. From the perspective of Bahujan thought, their deep reverence for and adherence to the Vedas should not be

redirected into allegiance to capitalist, landlord, or corporate interests, nor into support for ruling castes or economically dominant groups. Such devotion, it argues, should not become an instrument of caste-based or communal politics, and temples should not be converted into platforms for anti-Bahujan agendas.

Bahujan ideology further maintains that Hindu temples must embrace and promote the principle of equitable representation, ensuring that communities receive opportunities and benefits proportionate to their population, while also serving the broader cultural aspirations of society. The doors of temples, in this view, should remain equally open to all sections of the population. It therefore calls upon traditional institutions to be receptive to reform and social transformation.

In contemporary India, the most visible social tensions are often portrayed as conflicts between Brahmins and other communities, rather than as struggles between dominant castes and those seeking inclusion, dignity, and equality. These tensions reflect the continuing transformation of India's social structure. The divisions between Brahmins and various caste groups across regions are the outcome of a long historical

process shaped by social hierarchy, economic power, religious authority, caste dominance, demographic demands for justice, and the rise of modern political consciousness.

What is visible today represents a transition from a once widely accepted caste order to a society marked by continuous negotiation, assertion of rights, and demands for self-respect. Within this context, Bahujanism emerges as a significant ideological response. It seeks to challenge the political, economic, and social injustices experienced by Bahujan communities at the hands of economically empowered ruling and dominant castes.

At the same time, a multicultural perspective proposes that social groups should move beyond competing solely as castes. Instead, it advocates cooperation within a plural and multi-ethnic social framework, encouraging backward classes and marginalized communities to unite around shared goals of justice, equality, and collective progress.

3. The Problem of False Ideologies

In classical colonial systems, the colony functioned primarily as a supplier of inexpensive raw materials—typically agricultural produce, labor, or minerals—while the benefits of production and value addition accrued to the colonizing powers. This pattern was clearly evident under British rule in India. The Bahujans, compelled by necessity, labored as agricultural workers producing cotton, only to later purchase finished goods manufactured from that same cotton, along with other essential commodities, from British industries.

This structural condition has not fundamentally altered in the post-independence period. Within a Caste dominant power structure operating alongside capitalism, the Bahujans continue to serve as a source of cheap raw materials, particularly in the form of labor and agricultural output. In effect, Bahujan communities export little beyond their labor power. The products generated through this labor do not belong to them, as they lack ownership over both land and industrial means of production.

Consequently, under the control of the ruling castes and the Dominant castes, the Bahujans are positioned as a reservoir of low-cost labor for both national and global capitalist systems. This structural dependency explains the persistent push by contemporary ruling classes toward privatization of public sector institutions, thereby transferring control over economic resources and opportunities increasingly into the hands of capitalist and imperialist forces, often at the expense of Bahujan interests.

Despite varied interpretations offered by economists, the essential relationship between the Dominant castes and the Bahujans remains consistent. The Bahujans exist in a condition analogous to a colonial relationship within a caste-based social order, marked by institutional caste discrimination. This condition operates across three interrelated domains: political, economic, and social. Politically, the Bahujans remain subject to the authority of the Caste dominant power structure and the ruling castes; economically, they are subordinated to capitalist and imperialist systems; and socially, they are constrained by the dominance of the upper castes. Together, these dimensions define the structural reality of institutionalized caste hierarchy.

Historical experience demonstrates that in colonial settings, political decisions affecting the colonized were made by external authorities, either directly or through mechanisms of indirect rule. A similar pattern persists in contemporary India, where decisions shaping the lives of Bahujan communities have, since independence, largely remained under the control of upper-caste groups. The ruling castes have played a central role in this process, often advancing the development of their own caste interests with deliberate intent.

Within Bahujan Ideology, this arrangement is conceptualized as the “Dominant Caste power structure.” While some critics argue that power in modern society is distributed across multiple institutions and actors, invoking the idea of pluralism, such perspectives overlook a critical reality: in matters relating to caste and social hierarchy, this apparent diversity frequently converges into a unified structure. Whenever Bahujans assert their rights, the upper castes—despite internal differences—tend to consolidate into a cohesive front.

This dynamic becomes particularly evident when demands are articulated on the basis of Bahujan demographic strength. The

numerical majority of the Bahujans represents a potential source of political power, which generates apprehension among upper-caste groups. The greater the size and awareness of the Bahujan population, the more it is perceived as a challenge. This helps explain resistance to measures such as caste-based census initiatives. While some political formations have undertaken such exercises at the state level, resistance at the national level reflects broader structural concerns.

Furthermore, Bahujan Ideology highlights the relationship between education and political consciousness. In regions where illiteracy remains high, hierarchical ideologies often retain stronger influence. Conversely, an educated Bahujan population possesses the capacity to emerge as an organized and politically assertive force, which can unsettle established power structures. As a result, the expansion of education among Bahujans is sometimes perceived as a threat, leading to tendencies that weaken or undermine educational systems.

When confronted with challenges to their established privileges, caste-dominant groups often act collectively and decisively to protect their interests. They mobilize in unified forms to

preserve advantages they consider exclusive, employing various strategies—ranging from exclusion to systemic manipulation—to maintain control over resources and opportunities while limiting access for those outside their social boundaries.

In India, caste relations are not incidental social arrangements but the historical outcome of a prolonged process of Aryan expansion. Over centuries, this expansion facilitated the subjugation of Bahujans through the ideological framework of Hindu religious doctrines. As caste theories gradually crystallized and spread, they evolved into powerful instruments for structuring and legitimizing political dominance, economic control, and social hierarchy.

In contemporary political, economic, and social systems, groups that enjoy entrenched privileges continue to construct justificatory ideologies to preserve their advantages. Classes that have historically accumulated wealth, exercised authority, and attained social prestige often internalize these benefits as inherent rights. Consequently, such privileges are perceived as natural, legitimate, and tradition-bound. Any attempt to alter this established order provokes resistance, leading to the deliberate

construction of narratives that portray existing inequalities as both inevitable and justified. Hindutva plays a pivotal role in sustaining this ideological framework.

The Hindutva system functions as a comprehensive mechanism designed to preserve the interests of Dominant castes. It facilitates disparities in power, wealth, prestige, and knowledge; legitimizes hierarchical distinctions within religion; and promotes the imposition of unscientific beliefs and cultural practices upon Bahujans under the guise of faith. Simultaneously, it safeguards historically appropriated property, wealth, and natural resources. Within this system, power-holding groups perceive themselves as a cohesive collective, reinforcing one another's views and interests. As a result, the very notion of justice is gradually marginalized, shaped and constrained by the underlying ideological structure.

At the national level, allegations have been raised—most notably by Congress leader Rahul Gandhi—that the Election Commission has engaged in corrupt practices affecting the integrity of political power. While it is publicly asserted that the federal government possesses limited authority to intervene in

such matters, the judiciary appears to defer responsibility, leaving the resolution ambiguous. At the same time, the Hindutva-led government extends institutional protections, including immunity to Election Commissioners. This convergence of factors suggests a pattern in which state institutions operate in ways that enable and entrench the dominance of Hindutva. Such developments may be interpreted as serving the interests of upper castes, capitalist groups, and the bourgeoisie, thereby constituting a form of institutional pressure on Bahujans.

Even beyond the long history of oppression, the post-independence continuation of self-serving cultural and social practices—often under religious justification—indicates the persistence of structures that undermine humanistic values while reinforcing hierarchical dominance.

The repeated electoral successes of the BJP are often cited as evidence that Bahujan community continues to experience the influence of the Caste dominant power structure. This raises critical questions regarding the practical functioning of constitutional principles such as the separation of powers and

the system of checks and balances. In matters relating to power or caste, Dominant castes frequently act as a unified bloc. When their collective interests are at stake, the Caste dominant power structure can effectively override institutional boundaries, rendering these constitutional safeguards less effective. The phenomenon described as “Vote Chori” is presented as one such illustration.

A parallel may be drawn with colonial governance, particularly the concept of “indirect rule,” wherein colonial administrations governed through intermediary local leaders. This approach offered a cost-effective and politically manageable form of control. Similarly, the Caste dominant power structure is argued to operate through local Bahujan leaders who remain aligned with, and subordinate to, the leadership of Dominant castes. These leaders often exhibit greater loyalty to centralized political mechanisms than to their own communities. Consequently, they are constrained in exercising genuine authority or advocating effectively for their people. This dynamic reduces them to symbolic representatives rather than autonomous actors, prioritizing allegiance to Dominant or ruling caste political parties over the interests of Bahujan community.

As a result, the capacity of Bahujans to independently shape their socio-economic and political development is significantly weakened.

When an individual becomes integrated into the Caste dominant power structure of the Dominant castes, political participation often necessitates a gradual attenuation of their independent voice. In such circumstances, a Bahujan representative loses the capacity to articulate the concerns of their community with clarity and conviction, frequently rationalizing this compromise as a political necessity. Consequently, the presence of leaders with Bahujan social identity within many political parties in India reflects not genuine representation, but rather a system akin to political puppetry—one sustained by the authority of the Dominant castes. These leaders emerge through the approval and selection of Dominant caste interests and are therefore constrained to operate within the limits defined by the upper castes. This phenomenon is not region-specific; it is equally observable across both North and South India.

Bahujan Ideology fundamentally rejects the proposition that alignment with the political frameworks of the Dominant castes

is essential for securing maximum benefits. While such alignment may yield individual advantages—such as social prestige, material gain, or positional authority—it fails to address the structural political, economic, and social challenges confronting the Bahujan masses. This limitation arises from the hierarchical nature of political parties, where reform is typically a top-down process: only those changes sanctioned at higher levels are implemented at the grassroots. Even when transformative ideas aimed at empowering the Bahujans are conceived, caste-dominant leadership often resists their full realization, apprehensive that their implementation may enhance Bahujan influence and thereby diminish the entrenched power of the ruling castes. Although meaningful reform for Bahujan advancement must, in principle, proceed from the top downward, such reform remains unattainable within parties and ideological frameworks controlled by caste dominance and ruling caste interests. In contrast, revolutionary change operates from the bottom upward. When Bahujans at the grassroots level organize and mobilize collectively, the possibility of substantive transformation emerges. However, even such movements are not immune to infiltration by caste-dominant forces. Through their aligned media apparatus, these forces can discredit

movement-oriented leadership, misrepresent Bahujan self-rule as impractical or utopian, and undermine collective consciousness by targeting committed leaders or influencing politically disengaged sections of the Bahujan population. Under these conditions, revolutionary politics assumes central importance as a viable pathway for Bahujan emancipation.

It is not uncommon for individuals who challenge bourgeois, partisan, or corrupt leadership within caste-dominant political parties to face marginalization, exclusion, or expulsion. Such outcomes are characteristic of systems governed directly or indirectly by Dominant caste leadership. In the absence of genuine top-down reform, the suppression of Bahujan voices within these parties becomes routine. The belief held by some leaders with Bahujan identity—that their presence alone ensures representation within caste-dominant political structures—is fundamentally misplaced. This perception often serves to preserve individual political relevance rather than to secure substantive gains for the broader Bahujan community.

In practice, leaders with Bahujan social identity who operate under the patronage of Dominant castes frequently prove

ineffective and fail to command the confidence of the people. This is particularly evident in representatives elected from reserved constituencies under caste-dominant party structures. Over time, such arrangements create a widening disconnect between Bahujan leaders and the communities they ostensibly represent. As a result, the Bahujan masses increasingly cease to recognize these individuals as authentic representatives, instead perceiving them as intermediaries of Dominant caste interests. This erosion of trust undermines the unity that ought to exist between leadership and community, a pattern that recurs across the Indian political landscape.

The broader process of co-optation gives rise to a structural divide between the Bahujan leadership class and the Bahujan populace, reflecting a defining characteristic of caste-dominant neo-colonial conditions. Within this framework, a category of “captured leaders” has emerged among the Bahujans. Despite possessing technical competence and administrative capability, and despite their potential to contribute meaningfully to social progress, such individuals remain constrained by the very structures of power in which they are embedded, rendering them unable to act in the genuine interests of their community.

4. The Blue Inner Consciousness

Within the process of co-optation, the phenomenon extends beyond elected Bahujan leaders to encompass a significant section of the educated Bahujan class—namely, Group-1 and Group-2 officers, university professors, school teachers, government employees, and individuals occupying upper- to middle-level positions in business. Many among them, consciously or otherwise, function as agents of the Caste dominant power structure, seeking political advancement through alignment with caste dominant political parties. These individuals are typically well-educated, articulate, and in close and continuous engagement with Bahujan youth. Nevertheless, barring a few exceptions, the majority fail to provide constructive or resolute leadership that advances the interests of Bahujan people.

A recurring sentiment illustrates this detachment: government employees assert that their salaries are paid by the state, while retirees emphasize their dependence on pensions, often concluding that they have little to contribute to broader social discourse. This disposition reflects a deeper accommodation to

the system of Casteism. In pursuit of limited financial gain and socially constructed prestige, many have acquiesced to the dominance of upper castes. As a result, they have distanced themselves from struggles aimed at fundamentally challenging the caste-based order and transforming the material conditions of the Bahujans. Their followers and associates often mirror this adjustment, sustaining themselves within the patronage networks of caste dominant political parties. This pattern is both visible and pervasive.

The participation of Bahujans in caste dominant politics has also led, at times, to the misperception among Dominant castes that the existing system enjoys the endorsement of Bahujans. However, such a conclusion is analytically unsound. The involvement of Bahujans in these political formations does not necessarily signify their ideological acceptance of the Caste dominant power structure. Rather, Bahujan leaders within these parties often operate under constraints, lacking the depth of allegiance exhibited by Dominant castes. Their inclusion is frequently determined by demographic considerations, and their continued presence is shaped by structural compulsion.

Consequently, their support tends to assume the character of strategic compromise rather than genuine commitment.

In many instances, Bahujans are elevated to visible leadership positions within caste dominant political parties primarily as symbolic figures, with limited substantive authority. Their presence serves representational purposes, while their influence over decision-making remains constrained. The case of Narendra Modi is often cited in this context. Though publicly identified with a Bahujan social category, his political positioning is widely interpreted as aligned with the interests of the Caste dominant power structure. Extensive amplification by corporate media and party-driven communication networks has projected him as a Bahujan-identified leader, thereby facilitating the consolidation of Bahujan electoral support in favor of the Bharatiya Janata Party. This illustrates the broader tendency of caste dominant political formations to strategically deploy such representation for electoral gain. In this context, Bahujan Ideology emerges as a necessary and independent political framework.

Those who undertake the responsibility of representing Bahujans with sincerity must confront a fundamental reality: effective leadership cannot be pursued alongside the assurance of complete personal security. Individuals who challenge entrenched structures of caste hierarchy are likely to encounter resistance, including social, economic, and institutional reprisals. This may involve the loss of employment, status, and material privileges. Thus, there exists an inherent tension between Bahujan leadership and personal security. A leader who openly contests the foundations of Casteism cannot reasonably expect validation or protection from the very system being challenged. Leadership that moderates its voice in pursuit of limited gains ultimately confines itself to minor concessions, which the Dominant castes can extend without altering the structural foundations of inequality.

An additional dimension of political colonialism is reflected in the manipulation of electoral boundaries and the construction of a structurally flawed electoral system. It is frequently asserted that Bahujans constitute over 80 percent of the population. Given their demographic strength and, in many instances, geographic concentration, they possess the potential to emerge

as decisive electoral majorities across regions. If effectively mobilized, this collective strength could significantly challenge the dominance of caste-based political arrangements. However, Bahujans have not yet fully consolidated their electoral power in alignment with Bahujan Ideology. Caste dominant political systems perpetuate internal divisions among communities and employ mechanisms such as gerrymandering to dilute Bahujan voting strength, thereby preventing its accurate reflection in political outcomes. While such strategies may assist upper castes in sustaining control through division, they do not negate the fundamental reality that electoral success in this context ultimately depends upon the support of Bahujan voters.

The Caste dominant power structure, in its persistent effort to retain political authority within its own confines, exhibits considerable ingenuity. It not only devises new mechanisms to sustain its dominance but also effectively exploits the inherent weaknesses present within the existing system.

It is seldom acknowledged that in North India, the Backward Classes constitute nearly sixty percent of the population. However, due to their gradual absorption into the social and

political fold of the upper castes, coupled with the absence of distinct reservation provisions, the political representation of these communities has been significantly diminished.

In electoral contexts, a Bahujan candidate often possesses a strong likelihood of success when a seat is allocated to them. Nevertheless, to disrupt this potential, opposing political forces deliberately field candidates from the same caste or from another numerically significant Bahujan caste within the same constituency. This strategy fosters division between Bahujan communities, compelling them into competition and compromise. As a result, the collective strength of the Bahujans is fractured, and they are drawn into conflicts that undermine their broader interests. When the choice arises between a unified Bahujan identity and narrower caste affiliations, the tendency to prioritize caste loyalties inadvertently strengthens Casteism-oriented parties and enables the ruling castes to consolidate power. In such scenarios, the electoral influence of the Dominant castes becomes decisive, while the upper castes assume a determining role in shaping outcomes. Candidates aligned with dominant caste interests, capital, and broader structures of power are thereby positioned closer to electoral

success. These outcomes, though often presented as democratic victories, frequently reflect a system in which such representatives function as instruments of dominant interests rather than as authentic voices of Bahujan aspirations.

A condition reminiscent of colonial subjugation can be observed in the contemporary political behavior of the Bahujans, wherein an outward display of compliance coexists with underlying resentment toward the Dominant castes. In formal political settings, Bahujan representatives often appear to accept and endorse the strategies proposed by parties rooted in the Caste dominant power structure, even publicly expressing support. However, in private discourse, they acknowledge the constraints imposed upon them, frequently stating that the pursuit of Bahujan representation necessitates enduring the attitudes and dominance of the Dominant castes. Within their own communities, these leaders express dissatisfaction and attempt to portray themselves as committed advocates of Bahujan rights. Simultaneously, mechanisms of surveillance and control are maintained by dominant caste political structures to monitor such individuals. This duality of conduct has become a characteristic feature of contemporary political practice. Many

Bahujans, in private, concede their disapproval of the leadership of dominant caste-oriented parties, despite being compelled to collaborate with them.

The economic relations between Bahujan communities and the wider social structure in India reflect patterns analogous to colonial dependency. The political authority exercised by the Dominant castes and the economic marginalization experienced by the Bahujans operate in conjunction, reinforcing one another.

Historically, colonialism did not emerge as a civilizing enterprise but rather as a manifestation of competition among societies and powers. Colonial expansion was primarily driven by the pursuit of wealth, control, and strategic advantage. Colonized regions were structured to serve the economic interests of the colonizers, resulting in the systematic dependency of local populations. Such systems were often justified through narratives of religious propagation, social reform, or the upliftment of oppressed communities. In contemporary India, similar patterns persist, wherein the Caste dominant power structure sustains the economic dependence of Bahujan communities within a capitalist framework. These

structures often present themselves as benevolent allies, even as “friends” of the Bahujans, claiming to deliver welfare and development. However, their underlying objective remains the preservation of dominant caste authority and the pursuit of economic gain. Welfare initiatives, both governmental and private, frequently operate under the rhetoric of upliftment but, in practice, may diminish self-reliance and weaken collective resistance. This paternalistic orientation associated with the Dominant castes necessitates critical examination and rejection by Bahujan intellectuals.

The activities of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh illustrate another dimension of this dynamic. Its functionaries often engage with rural communities in the manner of modern-day missionaries, promoting religious and ideological agendas intertwined with political objectives. It is imperative for educated Bahujan activists to recognize such strategies and to articulate their implications to the broader community. In response, Bahujan leadership must cultivate an equally robust ideological framework and organizational capacity to effectively counter these influences.

The principle that reliance on the benevolence of the oppressor cannot yield genuine freedom has long been recognized within Bahujan thought. This understanding informed the movements led by Jyotirao Phule, B. R. Ambedkar, and Kanshi Ram, under whose leadership the Bahujan movement experienced significant phases of organization and assertion.

In the present context, however, the Caste dominant power structure has adapted its strategies. Individuals working with a commitment to Bahujan consciousness are identified and subjected to indirect forms of opposition. Organizational networks, including those associated with the RSS, extend into institutional spaces, where individuals may operate under the appearance of Bahujan identity while advancing dominant caste agendas. Such interventions contribute to the creation of divisions among Bahujan leaders themselves, particularly along caste lines. Furthermore, media institutions aligned with dominant interests amplify distinctions of caste, religion, region, and class, thereby impeding the emergence of Bahujan unity.

It is therefore misplaced to attribute the continued marginalization of the Bahujans to any inherent deficiency

within the community. Their condition is not the result of intrinsic weakness but of sustained structural constraints. The persistence of dominance can be understood as a consequence of systemic oppression, ideological manipulation, and strategic fragmentation. While narratives may suggest that Bahujans are unprepared for freedom, such assertions serve to obscure the realities of power and control embedded within the Caste dominant power structure.

In contemporary discourse, many leaders operating within the Hindu caste framework deny the existence of such a structure altogether. They often characterize caste as a functional system that promotes social order and productivity. Representatives of the Dominant castes similarly reject interpretations of their authority as oppressive or colonial in nature, instead portraying India as a space of abundant opportunity and freedom. However, such representations frequently overlook the enduring structural inequalities that continue to shape social, political, and economic life.

Colonialism, across many regions of the world, produced one of its most severe consequences by systematically, deliberately,

and callously pushing already vulnerable populations into deeper layers of social and economic marginalization. In the Indian context, the evolution of a Caste dominant power structure, drawing upon hierarchical traditions embedded within Hindu society, institutionalized a caste system that functioned primarily to secure the interests of select groups rather than to protect or advance the Bahujans.

Within this structure, entire communities were dehumanized and relegated to conditions akin to servitude. For centuries, they were denied access to adequate housing, proper healthcare, and meaningful education, thereby ensuring their continued subordination. The upper castes concentrated their control over land and organized labour along caste lines, effectively transforming human labour into a controlled and exploitable resource. Since agricultural production depended heavily on labour, securing it at the lowest possible cost became a central concern. Consequently, the Bahujans were compelled to provide sustained and inexpensive labour, with only a negligible proportion gaining limited access to land under systems of royal patronage.

Historically, under monarchic and zamindari arrangements, lands held by the upper castes required extensive labour for clearing, cultivation, and maintenance. The Bahujans, owing to their physical endurance, capacity for sustained labour in agriculture, construction, and artisanal work, as well as their enforced compliance within the caste order, were positioned as a readily available workforce. Their social conditioning, reinforced by religious beliefs and practices, further facilitated their subjugation.

The systematic denial of rights rendered Bahujans easily controllable and fully exploitable. This ensured a stable and continuous supply of labour essential for sustaining the economic interests of the ruling groups. Through the imposition of rigid religious codes and the invocation of *dharma*, mechanisms of control were legitimized, maintaining Bahujans in a state of moral, economic, and spiritual subordination. While some were reduced to forms of bonded labour, others were incorporated as indentured servants. The ideological framework of religion provided justification for punitive measures and discouraged dissent, compelling unquestioned service to the Dominant castes. Furthermore, the absence of alternative

economic opportunities prevented mobility, binding them permanently to this exploitative system.

As a result, the Bahujans became the foundational economic support of the upper castes. This structural dependency, established over centuries, has perpetuated conditions of economic deprivation among Bahujans that persist into the present. Within this socio-religious framework, Bahujans were not recognized as possessing rights that the Dominant castes were obligated to uphold. Instead, the caste system, supported by interpretations of *Sanatana Dharma*, legitimized their reduction to servitude for the benefit of the Dominant castes.

During periods when economic considerations predominated, the caste system provided a comprehensive and resilient form of protection to the upper castes. In contrast to the emphasis on spiritual salvation found in Christianity and Islam, the caste system offered an integrated structure of political, economic, and social security for the Dominant castes. The seemingly inexhaustible supply of Bahujan labour, coupled with enforced loyalty and belief, ensured that the Dominant castes could maintain their position without significant threat or instability.

5. The Poison of “Amrit Kaal”

The continuous supply of labor has historically been an indispensable requirement for the Dominant castes, and the caste system emerged as a crucial mechanism to secure this necessity. Over time, it developed into a deeply entrenched and enduring institution, one that remains among the most complex and unresolved social problems in the world. The preservation of the caste system continues to be a central agenda of the upper castes. Their allegiance lies not with the constitutional framework, but with the hierarchical status accorded to them by Hindu religious doctrine—a belief that persists to this day. Although slavery has been legally abolished, caste-based arrogance has not been eradicated from the social consciousness of those who uphold it.

Despite the repeated participation of Bahujans in wars to defend the nation, and their consistent demonstrations of patriotism, entrenched caste prejudice and systemic oppression have denied them an equal position within the social order. This exclusion continues unabated.

Historically, under the framework of Sanatana Dharma, Bahujans were excluded from participating in the wars of upper-caste rulers. However, in the post-independence period, a paradox has emerged: Bahujans are now mobilized as living breathing tools in political struggles that serve the interests of the Dominant castes, while simultaneously being excluded from positions of power. This contradiction perpetuates structural injustice. The situation resembles that of colonial rule, wherein the colonizer deploys subjugated populations in warfare to defend imperial interests, yet assumes no responsibility to grant them equality. Such wars, in effect, function to preserve existing social, political, and economic hierarchies. Even when wars produce surface-level changes, the fundamental relationship between ruler and subject remains largely intact. In this analogy, the Dominant castes occupy the position of the colonizer, while the Bahujans remain in a subordinated role. The persistence of such dynamics within a constitutional democracy constitutes a profound injustice.

In the post-independence era, despite their overwhelming contribution to productive labor—constituting nearly ninety-nine percent—and their continued expressions of national

loyalty, Bahujans are systematically denied political, economic, and social equality by the Dominant castes. Over the past twelve years, under the leadership of Narendra Modi, the Hindutva-oriented government has normalized these patterns. Public resistance to economic hardships has diminished significantly; price increases that would have once provoked widespread protest are now met with relative silence. Concurrently, the government has pursued policies that safeguard corporate interests, ensuring minimal disruption to investors while facilitating the extraction of Bahujan labor at low cost.

A persistent narrative portrays Bahujans as lacking merit, rights, political awareness, resources, and the capacity for collective organization. They are often characterized as historically enslaved populations who attained limited forms of spiritual liberation through the Bhakti movement, which emphasized devotion, surrender, and emotional piety as pathways to freedom. This narrative further depicts Bahujans as inexperienced in self-governance, lacking discipline and self-reliance, and driven by aspirations they cannot fully comprehend. They are described as disorganized, impulsive, averse to labor, and excessively desirous of power. Such

representations constitute distorted and derogatory constructions imposed by the Dominant castes.

In reality, Bahujans are communities subjected to systemic exploitation and ideological suppression, often masked by religious frameworks. They possess the capacity to understand structural inequalities and to organize collectively in pursuit of justice. It is imperative that Bahujans critically engage with these imposed narratives and recognize their underlying intent.

To sustain the ideological foundations of the caste system—which categorizes Bahujans as inferior and unworthy—various doctrinal justifications have been developed within the Hindu religious framework. The theory of karma is one such construct, often invoked to rationalize and legitimize social inequality.

In the contemporary context, the rise of artificial intelligence is significantly reducing the demand for human labor across multiple sectors, thereby diminishing employment opportunities for Bahujan communities. This development is closely linked to broader capitalist and imperialist economic processes. Technological advancements have enabled the creation of artificial systems that surpass human cognitive and physical

capabilities, leading to a devaluation of human labor. Consequently, populations that once formed the backbone of economic production are increasingly perceived as surplus. There are growing concerns that such systems disproportionately marginalize, and potentially seek to eliminate, economically vulnerable populations.

In India, the domestic capitalist structure is increasingly integrated with global capitalist networks. Under these conditions, the priorities of capital are confined to profit maximization, self-preservation, and expansion, with little regard for the welfare or advancement of laboring communities. Employment opportunities in critical sectors, including defense, have been curtailed under policies aligned with capitalist, imperialist, and Hindutva frameworks. Moreover, sectors that traditionally provided employment to Bahujans are either being downsized or subjected to privatization.

Even in sanitation work—historically assigned to marginalized communities due to the caste system—the Caste dominant power structure has perpetuated forms of exploitation and neglect. The transition of such employment into contractual

arrangements has further destabilized livelihoods and undermined long-term security. These developments reflect a deeply entrenched perspective rooted in hierarchical domination and reminiscent of earlier systems of servitude. The structural foundation of the Caste dominant power structure is closely intertwined with capitalist and imperialist modes of organization.

In the present era, characterized by technological transformation, declining employment opportunities, and the devaluation of labor, it is imperative for Bahujans to collectively confront and challenge the power structures of the Dominant castes. This struggle must be waged across political, economic, and social domains in order to achieve substantive equality and justice.

Bahujans must not interpret their present condition as a mere consequence of fate. Rather, they must consciously identify those political leaders shaped by Casteism, who, upon assuming positions as ruling classes, implement policies that reinforce the Caste dominant power structure. They must also recognize those political parties and officials who, having aligned themselves

with upper castes, have effectively transformed into neo-upper-caste formations. A corrective response to such forces must be expressed through the democratic instrument of the vote.

The concept of the Bahujan collective must be adhered to with the force of a principle—almost as a binding norm or directive. It functions not only as a source of guidance and inspiration but also, at times, as a compelling moral force. This idea embodies a profound sense of unity among its members. When individuals internalize their identity as part of this collective, they naturally come under the influence of its shared consciousness, thereby evolving into a socially and politically assertive group. This transformation was evident under the leadership of Kanshi Ram. It is through such collective awareness that justice for future generations of Bahujans can be secured.

Conversely, those who fail to recognize themselves as part of the Bahujan collective pose a significant challenge to its future. It is observable that some individuals within Bahujan or progressive movements reject their Bahujan identity and attempt to emulate the lifestyle and values of upper castes. Such

tendencies undermine collective progress and pose a latent threat to future Bahujan generations.

Individuals assess their own worth based on their lived experiences within the broader social order. For those situated within Bahujan social conditions, daily experiences often involve a denial of dignity and respect. It is therefore natural for such individuals to develop doubts regarding their own value. Hinduism, to an extent, has responded to these doubts within its own ideological framework by assigning differentiated social experiences along caste lines. Some were relegated outside the village, others to the margins of the street, some to the periphery of the household, while a few were permitted entry within it.

Communities subjected to persistent exclusion inevitably begin to question whether the recognition accorded to them, their families, and their social group is adequate or just. They reflect upon whether they are treated with dignity or subjected to humiliation. Such recurring doubts gradually transform into the seeds of mutual suspicion and hostility. Over time, these seeds have grown into entrenched divisions, resulting in antagonism among caste groups.

Hatred, in itself, is never a constructive or justifiable response. Nevertheless, hatred and violence have come to characterize the functioning of the Caste dominant power structure maintained by dominant castes. In certain contexts, Bahujans too have begun to organize collectively in resistance against upper castes. This has led to a condition wherein retaliation—violence in response to violence and hatred in response to hatred—is becoming normalized. However, rather than perpetuating such cycles, it is both necessary and desirable to dismantle the Caste dominant power structure, along with the capitalist system that sustains it, and to establish a Bahujan-centered order founded upon principles of equality, justice, and compassion.

The term “Panchajanya,” associated with the conch of Sri Krishna, is derived from the mythological account that it was fashioned from the bones of the demon Panchajana. In 1974, a text attributed to Golwalkar under the same title characterized the slogan “greater benefit for the majority” as immature. It was already understood that societies driven purely by self-interest are prone to internal conflict, and that such conflict obstructs the realization of human unity and collective welfare. Yet, the ideal

encapsulated in the phrase “May all be happy, may all be free from illness” has found little reflection in actual practice.

In the contemporary Caste dominant power structure upheld by dominant castes, the frequently articulated ideals of self-governance, indigenous production, and inclusive development remain largely rhetorical. Through strategic and often deceptive discourse, Bahujan movements have been suppressed or absorbed. Moreover, the Hindu caste order has advanced certain illusory pathways of “liberation” for Bahujans: imitation of upper-caste behavior, devotional submission, cultivation of hostility toward other castes while glorifying one’s own, or complete assimilation into dominant caste ideology and culture.

For religious minorities such as Christians and Muslims, Hindutva proposes a pathway through ritual conversion, enabling their reintegration into the Hindu fold under the notion of “Ghar Wapsi.” However, no corresponding pathway exists for a Panchama, a Bahujan, or a Shudra to attain the status of an upper varna or caste.

It may be observed that, within its contemporary mode of governance, the Caste dominant power structure appears to

pursue the deliberate objective of cultivating a Bahujan elite class deeply immersed in caste-based “culture.” In this process, Bahujans who might otherwise follow emancipatory paths are gradually transformed into members of an elite stratum aligned with dominant interests.

A historical parallel may be found in the phenomenon of the *Assimilado* under Portuguese colonial rule. This term referred to Black individuals who adopted Portuguese customs, dress, and language, and who attained a minimum level of formal education. Such individuals were granted preferential treatment, including improved living conditions, social recognition, and institutional support from Portuguese authorities. They were permitted access to spaces otherwise restricted to Europeans, such as restaurants and social establishments, and were even afforded opportunities for international travel. In certain instances, colonial authorities facilitated their integration into European social structures through arranged marriages. However, this conditional inclusion required a complete disavowal and devaluation of their native African heritage.

A comparable pattern can be discerned in the contemporary Indian context, where Hindutva seeks to normalize and legitimize caste hierarchy by encouraging Bahujans to internalize and revere the values of the caste-dominant order. This process results in the emergence of individuals who exist between two cultural frameworks, often embodying a form of social and psychological duality. Such individuals may be described as “integrated,” insofar as they adopt the worldview of the dominant order while distancing themselves from their own historical and cultural roots. In doing so, they tend to regard Bahujan heritage as inferior and indigenous knowledge systems as lacking validity.

These “integrated” individuals are often projected by the upper castes as exemplars of progress—individuals who have ostensibly transcended caste limitations and achieved development. However, this representation obscures a more complex reality: by dissociating themselves from their communities, they may inadvertently reinforce existing structures of discrimination. Rather than challenging systemic inequities, their integration can serve to legitimize and perpetuate them.

Such mechanisms function to suppress the intellectual and creative potential within Bahujan community. Frequently, these individuals are positioned as intermediaries, tasked with representing Bahujan interests while remaining aligned with the priorities of the Caste dominant power structure. As a result, genuine articulation of Bahujan aspirations is often diluted or misrepresented. Leadership emerging from this process may lack organic legitimacy among the people it claims to represent. This dynamic closely resembles the colonial strategy of co-optation, wherein select individuals are incorporated into the dominant system to stabilize and sustain it.

In this context, there arises a pressing need for Bahujan community to undertake a process of self-definition. This involves the articulation of its own values, priorities, and collective goals, followed by a concerted effort to organize around them. Historically, caste-based hierarchies have systematically excluded Bahujans from meaningful participation in political life, while simultaneously justifying their economic exploitation through the denial of rights and misrepresentation of identity. Even in contemporary discourse, there are assertions

that the Bahujan category lacks substantive political, economic, or social relevance.

To counter such narratives, it is essential for Bahujans to define themselves on their own terms. Reclaiming historical memory and cultural identity constitutes a foundational step in this process. Without such reclamation, meaningful progress in political, economic, and social domains remains constrained.

At present, under the ideological framework of Hindutva and cultural nationalism, patterns of marginalization and exploitation persist. In response, it becomes necessary for Bahujans to develop their own conceptual and linguistic frameworks through which they can articulate their identity and social position. The recognition and acceptance of such frameworks are critical prerequisites for equitable development, though they are often resisted by entrenched power structures.

Political power, in this context, may be understood as the capacity to shape perceptions and exercise influence over collective consciousness. The upper castes, through control over dominant narratives, seek to establish their interpretations of history and social reality as universally accepted truths. This

raises a fundamental question: does the authority to define social categories rest with those who wield power, or with those who have historically experienced marginalization?

The term “Dalit,” within Indian political discourse, illustrates this contestation of meaning. From an Ambedkarite perspective, it signifies both the historical experience of oppression and an assertion of dignity and self-respect. Within mainstream political discourse, alternative terminologies such as “Scheduled Castes” are employed in formal contexts, while the term “Dalit” continues to retain social significance. In leftist interpretations, the concept extends beyond caste to encompass broader structures of economic exploitation. Political formations such as the Bahujan Samaj Party have utilized the term as a tool for mobilization, representation, and empowerment.

Conversely, proponents of Hindutva, including organizations such as the Bharatiya Janata Party, often view the term as socially divisive within the framework of the Caste dominant power structure. This divergence of interpretations underscores the broader struggle over representation and identity.

Earlier reformist efforts, including those associated with Mahatma Gandhi and the term “Harijan,” sought to address caste-based inequities but did not achieve universal acceptance among the communities concerned. This outcome further emphasizes the importance of self-definition: whether the authority to define a community lies with those in positions of power, with reformers, or with the communities themselves.

Thinkers such as Jyotirao Phule, B. R. Ambedkar, and Kanshi Ram conceptualized the Bahujan community as a collective that bears the weight of historical injustice while striving toward dignity and justice in political, economic, and social spheres. This definition underscores the dynamic and aspirational nature of the Bahujan identity. The capacity to define, in this sense, is closely linked to the capacity to influence and control social realities.

Just as imperial systems historically expanded their dominance, thereby generating resistance among subordinated populations, the pursuit of supremacy by the Dominant castes similarly creates conditions for collective assertion and resistance among Bahujans.

The ideological appeal of Hindutva, encapsulated in slogans promoting religious unity and pride, may also function as a mechanism for reshaping identity in ways that obscure structural inequalities. While such narratives may resonate with the upper castes, their implications differ significantly for historically marginalized communities. The oft-cited observation by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels that religion can function as an instrument of social control acquires a distinct dimension in this context. Religious structures may serve as sources of comfort and legitimacy for dominant groups, while reinforcing hierarchies that disadvantage others.

Historical patterns of religious conversion among marginalized communities further illustrate this dynamic. Faced with systemic exclusion, some Dalits and Adivasis embraced alternative religious traditions, while sections of backward and upper caste communities sought different forms of social and spiritual expression. These choices reflect complex responses to entrenched inequalities, rather than purely religious conversion for rice bags.

6. Bahujan Consciousness

The processes of definition, representation, and cultural negotiation remain central to the ongoing struggle for equality and justice. The question of who defines social reality—and in whose interest—continues to shape the contours of political and social transformation.

The Bahujans of this country must cultivate the courage to pose fundamental and unsettling questions—questions that challenge the very foundations of a caste-based social order. They must critically examine the inherited values, entrenched beliefs, and customary practices that have long sustained Casteism. In particular, they must interrogate the historical denial of access to education, dignity, property rights, temple entry, spiritual legitimacy, and positions of leadership. For centuries, the preservation of caste dominance has relied upon carefully constructed myths and ideological distortions; even in the present, such narratives continue to be deployed. It is therefore imperative for the Bahujans to question how long such dominance can persist through these mechanisms of manipulation.

In definitional terms, the Bahujans may be understood as a collective that has been subordinated by the upper castes through the use of fabricated narratives, with the objective of ensuring a continuous and inexpensive supply of labor and services. In this context, it becomes essential for the Bahujans to recover their historical consciousness, to rediscover their origins, and to develop a sustained awareness of their cultural inheritance. Only through such an engagement with their past can they come to recognize themselves as a cohesive, resilient, and self-aware social force.

The documented histories of this country provide little space for the experiences and contributions of the Bahujans. Even the limited historical references that do exist are increasingly subject to distortion under contemporary ideological influences such as Hindutva. For generations, the upper castes have perpetuated the claim that the Bahujans possess neither culture nor a coherent history, thereby giving rise to the characterization of Bahujans as “people without history.” However, prior to the codification of royal and religious histories under Hindu orthodoxy, the Bahujans possessed structured cultural traditions and historical trajectories of their own, which were

systematically suppressed. While fragments of this suppressed history may occasionally appear in mythological narratives, they have been deliberately excluded from mainstream historiography. As the primary producers within society, the Bahujans must recognize the existence and significance of their own historical legacy. A comprehensive understanding of their collective identity is indispensable if they are to effectively confront caste-based discrimination and its associated structural inequalities. This process of awakening may be described as Bahujan Consciousness, and it constitutes a foundational step toward social transformation.

A critical dimension of this transformation lies in the process of “political modernization,” through which the Bahujans must necessarily pass in order to achieve liberation from entrenched caste hierarchies. Although political modernization encompasses multiple dimensions, it may be analytically understood through three principal components: first, the critical interrogation of traditional values and rigid social structures; second, the exploration of alternative political arrangements capable of addressing persistent political and economic challenges; and third, the expansion of participatory mechanisms to ensure

broad inclusion in decision-making processes. The struggle for political modernization is not merely instrumental but generative of meaning for future generations of Bahujans. It serves to test existing convictions and to cultivate the intellectual and moral capacity required to question entrenched institutional frameworks.

When prevailing social values themselves sustain caste discrimination, the imposition of such values upon the Bahujans stands in direct contradiction to principles of humanism. The internalization of these values by sections of the Bahujan community represents, in effect, a form of collective self-betrayal. Accordingly, the Bahujans must categorically reject the proposition that the caste system—being the foundational basis of the Caste dominant power structure—ought to be preserved under the pretext of Sanatana Dharma.

Furthermore, the aspiration of the Bahujans cannot be reduced to mere assimilation into the middle class. Empirical evidence suggests that significant segments of the middle class have, over time, diminished their ethical commitment to humanistic values, privileging material accumulation over holistic human

development. Although this class professes support for quality education, accessible healthcare, accountable governance, improved standards of living, employment opportunities, and developmental advancement, its conduct in matters of caste reveals an enduring sense of hierarchical superiority. Similarly, in matters of religion, it often assumes a position of elevated status, while simultaneously exhibiting implicit forms of exclusion toward minority groups within the broader Bahujan collective. In this manner, the middle class functions as a structural foundation for institutionalized caste discrimination. Consequently, even as it articulates demands for good governance and effective leadership, it simultaneously facilitates the continued exploitation of the Bahujan population and legitimizes the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few upper castes or ruling castes.

The proposition advanced by certain sections—that integration into the Bahujan middle class should be treated as a primary objective—demands careful and critical scrutiny by the broader Bahujan community. The normative framework of the dominant middle class, in many respects, stands in contradiction to the principles of human dignity. Historically, the Bahujan

movement neither mounted a sustained critique of these values nor adequately apprehended their underlying character; instead, it assimilated them without sufficient interrogation. This necessitates a comprehensive redefinition of its ideological and moral foundations.

Conditions such as poverty, social indignity, and systemic oppression must not be interpreted as incidental outcomes of governmental inefficiency or partisan neglect. Rather, they must be recognized as deliberate and sustained consequences of the Caste dominant power structure, constituting a profound affront to Bahujan community. In response to narratives that advocate “free trade,” there must emerge a countervailing discourse that prioritizes the creation of a society grounded in the principle of “free human beings.” Such a vision alone embodies authentic modernization and marks a substantive progression toward a truly civilized social order.

The persistence of outdated political, economic, and caste-based structures that reinforce regressive values must be decisively addressed. It is crucial, in this regard, to distinguish between the “system” and “structures.” The “system” refers to the

overarching constellation of societal values, beliefs, and institutional norms, whereas “structures” denote the specific organizational entities—such as political parties, associations, and state mechanisms—that operate within this framework. While the Constitution provides a robust normative foundation, structural reform alone is insufficient if the system itself remains fundamentally flawed. A critical limitation has been the inability of Bahujan community to conceptualize and pursue modernization in a coherent, strategic, and sustained manner.

Furthermore, political parties in India have, since their inception, exhibited limited commitment to identifying and addressing the substantive needs of the populace, particularly those of the Bahujans. The party system evolved during a period when demands for social justice were still in a formative stage. In the present context, socio-economic realities have undergone significant transformation, and ideological frameworks have correspondingly diminished in influence. Leadership must therefore reorient its focus from abstract formulations to the lived experiences and material conditions of the Bahujans. Where necessary, the establishment of parallel social institutions should be pursued. Effective control over key sectors—

education, healthcare, revenue administration, human resources, industry, law enforcement, and the judiciary—must be democratized to reflect Bahujan interests. Institutional mechanisms must be reconstituted to ensure that decision-making processes are genuinely aligned with the welfare of the Bahujan majority.

A central dimension of political modernization lies in the expansion of representational participation. It is imperative that Bahujans, in their entirety, attain a heightened level of political consciousness. Rather than acquiescing to corrupt administrative systems or uncritical traditional narratives for limited gains, individuals must actively reinforce their commitment to Bahujan Ideology and engage in public life with accountability and responsibility.

As political awareness deepens, Bahujans will increasingly discern the structural injustices that shape their lived realities. They will recognize the disparity between the growing affluence of caste-dominant groups and the continued marginalization of their own communities. This recognition is likely to catalyze collective political action. Upon realizing that prevailing values

and institutional arrangements operate to their disadvantage, they will begin to interrogate the legitimacy of the entire system. It is at this critical juncture that political modernization takes substantive form. Although this process has already commenced, it remains tentative; its consolidation through expanded representation constitutes a collective responsibility of Bahujan community.

The concept of Bahujan state power articulates a call for unity among Bahujans across the nation, urging them to reclaim their shared historical consciousness and to cultivate a cohesive social identity. It advocates for the autonomous determination of goals, the independent management of institutions, and the internalization of this framework as an active instrument in the pursuit of justice. Concurrently, it calls for the rejection of caste-dominant values and institutional forms as an integral component of political modernization. Bahujan Ideology cautions that failure to engage with this transformative project risks perpetuating conditions of subordination.

At its core, the notion of Bahujan state power rests upon a foundational principle: in a heterogeneous and pluralistic

society, effective participation in power structures necessitates prior internal cohesion. Meaningful deliberation within a multicultural context must precede coordinated collective action, and such action is contingent upon the establishment of social unity. Traditionally, caste groups have sought stability by organizing themselves into caste-based associations to represent their interests. The Caste dominant power structure engages predominantly with these segmented entities, while corporate-aligned media amplifies their perspectives. This dynamic serves to fragment and weaken broader Bahujan solidarity. The proliferation of caste associations and caste-based political formations thus undermines the prospects of unified Bahujan mobilization.

Empirical observations of electoral behavior indicate that Bahujans frequently participate in caste-based voting practices. Even within the secrecy of the ballot, voting along caste lines—or for caste-based political entities—constitutes an implicit endorsement of Casteism. In effect, it represents a tacit consent to loot of the Caste dominant power structure across successive electoral cycles. While this reality may be disquieting, it remains a defining characteristic of contemporary Indian

politics. Caste-based organizations and parties typically pursue their objectives through competitive differentiation rather than collaborative engagement. Even in instances of cooperation, their collective actions often reinforce broader capitalist and imperialist frameworks.

The political effectiveness of the Bahujans in this country is directly proportional to the extent to which they reconnect with their authentic Bahujan roots. These roots possess a strength that surpasses that of narrow caste identities; they embody the capacity to challenge and ultimately displace the entrenched authority of the upper castes. When various social groups limit themselves to invoking their caste identities and deploying their electoral power merely to secure representation for their own caste within parties operating under a caste dominant power structure, such actions undermine the foundational principles of Bahujan Ideology. Even in the present context, there are numerous instances in which Bahujan allies, often inadvertently, have contributed to the consolidation of caste-based dominance.

It is imperative that Bahujans assume control over their own institutions. The articulation of transformative and emancipatory

ideas—those that affirm their collective potential—must originate from within the Bahujan community itself. While representatives of landlord or Dominanat castes who express support for Bahujan Ideology may be acknowledged, the responsibility for leadership must unequivocally remain with Bahujans. Sustained efforts to cultivate Bahujan consciousness within society are essential, as such awareness constitutes the foundation of political empowerment. Accordingly, Bahujans must act in unity, guided by the principles of self-identification, self-determination, and collective solidarity, in order to realize their aspirations.

The Bahujan community must prioritize the acquisition of adequate political, economic, and professional strength, enabling it to compete on equal terms with the upper castes. Only after achieving such parity should considerations of cooperation with the caste dominant power structure be entertained. However, contemporary political practice frequently deviates from this principle. Even leaders identified with Bahujan communities often subordinate collective welfare and long-term development to immediate political survival, engaging in alliances with caste dominant political parties. In

this context, Bahujan political families that have historically experienced marginalization must consolidate leadership within the framework of Bahujan Ideology, while fostering unity across the broader Bahujan community. In its progression toward greater cohesion and empowerment, the Bahujan community must cultivate autonomy, ensuring the capacity to govern its own affairs. The concept of “Bahujan state power” denotes equitable representation and a just share in governance. It entails the construction of institutional centers of authority grounded in ideological conviction, capable of resisting systemic oppression.

The mere presence of Bahujan individuals in positions of power does not, in itself, constitute “Bahujan state power.” Visibility within the political sphere, absent substantive transformation, is insufficient. Indeed, many contemporary leaders who claim Bahujan identity do not embody the principles of genuine Bahujan empowerment. Authentic political authority must emerge organically from the community, and leadership must be rooted in its ideological foundations. Even at the cost of personal or political advantage, such leaders must refrain from functioning as instruments of caste dominant political

mechanisms. Only under these conditions can a durable and independent Bahujan power structure be established.

Casteism is not limited to the segmentation of society along caste lines; it also encompasses the systematic oppression and continued subordination of Bahujans. The enduring objective of caste-based dominance has been to confine Bahujan communities to subordinate positions, a reality that has persisted over centuries. A critical dimension of the problem lies in the inability of the caste dominant power structure to advance social justice and ensure equitable opportunities, while Bahujans themselves are often drawn into internal caste rivalries.

7. Definition, Determination, and Identity

Bahujan Ideology, which advocates self-identification, self-determination, and social justice, should not be misconstrued as a project of Bahujan domination. Its fundamental aim is to foster a free, stable, and progressive social order conducive to the comprehensive development of Bahujan communities. In doing so, it critically engages with the caste-based character of Indian politics and its concentration of power, seeking to reorient both toward a more equitable and inclusive framework.

Bahujan Ideology, while affirming the importance of collective unity and identity, does not advocate the replication of outcomes produced by the Caste dominant power structure. It neither seeks monopolistic control over institutions nor aspires to reproduce systems of domination. Its fundamental objective is not to exercise power over others or to perpetuate exploitation, but to secure a just and equitable share in the distribution of power within society. Such a vision is grounded in the principle that rightful entitlements must be fairly allocated among all sections.

At its core, Bahujan self-determination and self-identification signify that Bahujans must possess complete authority over decisions that shape their lives and futures. Their identity must emerge from their own value systems rather than external impositions. Historically, Bahujans have not engaged in acts of collective violence against other castes or religious communities, nor have they resorted to the desecration of places of worship, manipulation of legal frameworks, or systematic humiliation of others. These tendencies are characteristic of entrenched caste dominance. The prolonged denial of power to Bahujans has, however, led to a moral crisis—where the persistent absence of justice transforms legitimate grievances into disordered anger. Powerlessness fosters dependency, while unchecked power without ethical restraint becomes a defining feature of the Caste dominant power structure. This duality poses a significant threat to the foundational stability of the nation.

The marginalization of Bahujans has occurred not at the level of individuals but as a collective condition. They have been systematically portrayed as lacking the competence and legitimacy required for participation in governance and

decision-making. Consequently, they have been deprived of political, economic, and social power. In response, Bahujan Ideology emphasizes the necessity of unity and collective agency as essential instruments for overcoming structural exclusion.

The Caste dominant power structure encourages Bahujans to compete as isolated individuals for limited opportunities, thereby fragmenting their collective strength. However, the demand for opportunities arises from the needs of the Bahujan community as a whole, not merely from a select few. Therefore, it becomes imperative for Bahujans to consolidate their collective identity and build the capacity required to assume positions of power from a position of strength and cohesion. No community willingly accepts perpetual subordination. For over seven decades, Bahujan community has, through democratic processes, effectively granted governing authority to the Caste dominant power structure. Despite sustained discourse over the past three decades on issues of Bahujan empowerment and social justice, there has been minimal transformation among the ruling castes. The prevailing power structure neither recognizes nor accepts the legitimacy of Bahujan self-governance. Instead,

it seeks to preserve the status quo by fostering divisions and conflicts along caste lines. It resists the principle of proportional representation in decision-making and governance, likely out of apprehension that the historically oppressed may reciprocate the patterns of dominance and exclusion they have endured.

The Bahujan position remains clear: the current state of representation is both unjust and inhumane. There exists no viable alternative to the pursuit of genuine economic, political, and social justice. This necessitates deliberate and sustained efforts toward strengthening collective Bahujan power. Furthermore, Bahujan Ideology maintains that if power is attained through principles rooted in ethical conduct and social harmony, it will remain free from the distortions of caste arrogance.

Historical processes of social transformation often yield unanticipated outcomes. The movement initiated under the leadership of Kanshi Ram provided a coherent direction to Bahujan community. His slogans were not rhetorical devices but expressions of deeply embedded aspirations among historically marginalized communities. The principle articulated through

“Jisaki Jitni Sankhya Bhari, Usaki Utani Hissedari” underscores the demand for representation proportional to population. Similarly, the slogan “Vote Hamara, Raj Tumhara, Nahi Chalega, Nahi Chalega” asserts that political power must align with electoral strength. These formulations played a pivotal role in unifying Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and Other Backward Classes into a consolidated political force, advancing the struggle for social justice, political empowerment, and equitable representation. They revitalized collective self-respect and demonstrated a pathway for transforming demographic strength into political authority. This movement represented a transformative shift, transcending the constraints of caste dominance, fear, and opportunistic alliances, and was grounded in principles of progress, non-violence, and inclusivity. Its revival remains essential for the continued consolidation of Bahujan unity.

The demands articulated by Bahujans are fundamentally just. However, rather than remaining confined to rhetorical questioning regarding continued marginalization and unequal access to opportunities, there is a need for assertive political articulation. Inspired by the vision of Kanshi Ram, Bahujans

must actively uphold the principle of proportional representation and reaffirm their collective claim to governance based on democratic legitimacy. The structural character of the nation's political, economic, and social institutions has historically enabled systemic oppression of Bahujans. During the anti-colonial struggle, non-violence functioned as a central ideological and strategic tool in the absence of constitutional safeguards. In the present context, however, the existence of a constitutional framework guarantees equal rights and promises justice across multiple dimensions.

Within the Bahujan movement, non-violence must be understood in a nuanced manner. In conditions of structural inequality, it has often functioned as a strategic instrument rather than an absolute principle. While it can confer moral legitimacy, it does not, by itself, address material disparities in power. In a democratic and constitutional order where citizenship is formally equal but actual power remains unevenly distributed, non-violence elevates the ethical position of Bahujans but must be complemented by effective mechanisms of political assertion.

In this regard, the vote emerges as a critical instrument of democratic resistance. When institutions fail to protect citizens, the electorate retains the capacity to assert its will through political participation. The responsibility of safeguarding rights thus increasingly shifts toward collective political action. Consequently, Bahujans must employ unity as a foundational principle and the vote as a strategic instrument in their pursuit of economic, political, and social justice. The Bahujans have come to recognize, through prolonged experience of injustice and oppression, that struggle constitutes the only viable means of resisting entrenched inequities. The slogan “*Jitna Abadi Utna Haq*” generated apprehension among sections of the upper castes, as it signaled the potential emergence of organized resistance from the Bahujan masses.

The principle is unequivocal: no social order can sustain itself in the absence of social justice. The Caste dominant power structure must therefore desist from manipulating or marginalizing the Bahujans; failing this, resistance will inevitably intensify. The possibility of widespread, nationwide mobilization is no longer remote but increasingly imminent.

A closer examination of the concept of “integration” is necessary in this context. This idea posits that social justice can be achieved by incorporating Bahujans into existing structures of power and institutional frameworks. However, the underlying assumption of this approach is that Bahujan community lacks intrinsic value or productive capacity. Consequently, the Caste dominant power structure promotes the selective inclusion of a limited number of “qualified” individuals into the middle-class order. While this approach may facilitate the upward mobility of a small segment of Bahujans, it simultaneously depletes the broader community of its leadership and intellectual resources. Those who are symbolically absorbed into the middle class often assume the role of a new Dominant castes, thereby perpetuating caste-based discrimination. They neither represent nor advance the interests of the wider Bahujan population; instead, they function as symbolic figures that alleviate the moral discomfort of the ruling castes.

Such individuals frequently advocate that Bahujans should be regarded solely as individuals rather than as a collective, and that the notion of a Bahujan community should be disregarded. This position is fundamentally flawed. The experiences of

marginalization and deprivation among Bahujans have been collective in nature, and therefore their emancipation must also be pursued through collective action. In this regard, Bahujan Ideology maintains that individual-level remedies are insufficient to address systemic social problems. Within the prevailing social framework, a Bahujan cannot exist as an identity-neutral individual. Social identity remains an enduring and inescapable determinant, the effects of which persist across generations. Recognizing this reality and organizing resistance accordingly does not constitute separatism; rather, it represents a necessary and historically grounded form of struggle. The Bahujan community acknowledges that without sustained and intensive struggle in the present, meaningful transformation in the future cannot be realized.

The notion of “integration,” in effect, obscures the structural dimensions of the Bahujan condition and diminishes its significance. It reinforces the belief that access to essential resources—such as housing, education, employment, security, and political power—is contingent upon the approval of the Caste dominant power structure and the acceptance of its authority. This, in turn, perpetuates the perception that upper

castes are inherently superior, while Bahujans are subordinate. From this perspective, integration functions as a mechanism for maintaining caste hierarchy rather than dismantling it. Substantive equality remains the only means by which this condition can be fundamentally altered. Furthermore, the process of integration often necessitates the abandonment of Bahujan identity and cultural heritage, thereby posing a risk of social and cultural erasure. It is not the Bahujan community that must be dissolved, but rather the structures of caste discrimination and subordination imposed upon it.

The preservation of Bahujan cultural identity must proceed alongside the pursuit of social and political freedom. The ethos of this struggle must be grounded in self-respect rather than arrogance. Just as an individual cannot attain wholeness by rejecting a part of oneself, a society cannot achieve integrity by negating its own identity. Despite the evident validity of these principles, the entrenched nature of caste dominance resists their acceptance, reflecting a deeply embedded structural arrogance. The exercise of leadership in guiding communities toward progress is widely recognized as legitimate; this right must equally extend to the Bahujans. The concept of “alliance” also

warrants careful consideration. It conceptualizes the Bahujan movement as an intermediary between dominant caste forces and dependent Bahujan groups. The broader question of how to engage with political alliances—how to negotiate power and construct political relationships—is central to understanding the pursuit of Bahujan political empowerment.

A prevailing assumption within the socio-political landscape is that Bahujans can most effectively secure their rights by aligning with favorable political forces, particularly through participation in ruling coalitions. Such alliances are believed to enable influence over legislative processes and social policy, thereby creating opportunities to challenge caste-based hierarchies.

In its formative stages, the Bahujan movement emphasized autonomous identity and displayed reluctance toward coalition politics. Over time, however, this position evolved. Kanshi Ram articulated a pragmatic approach in which political power was viewed not as an adjunct to ideology but as a primary instrument for shaping social transformation. The alliances he pursued were strategic rather than ideological, reflecting a calculated effort to

expand political influence. His objective was to consolidate organizational strength and to establish Mayawati in a position of leadership. This approach prioritized the acquisition of power, with ideological engagement to follow. Kanshi Ram regarded alliances not as enduring commitments but as temporary mechanisms for navigating a fragmented political landscape. At one stage, he aligned with Mulayam Singh Yadav in opposition to Hindutva, a partnership symbolized by the slogan “*Mile Mulayam–Kanshi Ram, Hawa Mein Ud Gaye Jai Shri Ram.*” Subsequently, in the mid-1990s, he entered into strategic arrangements with the Bharatiya Janata Party, facilitating Mayawati’s elevation to the office of Chief Minister. These alliances were not grounded in ideological convergence but were pragmatic decisions intended to secure political power and advance Bahun leadership within the structures of governance.

8. Types of Alliances

In the political thought of Kanshi Ram, politics is not a domain governed by moral sanctity; rather, it is an arena in which only those possessing strength and strategy are able to endure. He maintained that without the acquisition of political power, the idea of social justice remains confined to rhetoric. Even temporary control over power, he argued, could serve as a crucial instrument for awakening a dormant and marginalized society.

Critics, however, have often characterized such political alliances in negative terms. According to certain perspectives, these alliances have diluted the collective consciousness of Bahujans, particularly among minority groups, and have weakened the broader objective of unity. Consequently, the aspiration for Bahujan unity has appeared to recede, becoming less distinct and more uncertain.

Nevertheless, the outright rejection of alliances is not a practical approach for those seeking political power. Instead, it is essential to critically examine the principles upon which

alliances are constructed. The theory of alliances rests upon three fundamental assumptions.

The first assumption is that the interests of Bahujans in India are identical to the interests of society at large. This assumption is flawed, as it presumes that whatever benefits the nation as a whole will necessarily benefit Bahujans, ignoring the structural inequalities embedded within society.

The second assumption is that stable and enduring alliances can be formed between socially, economically, and politically secure groups and those who remain insecure and marginalized. This overlooks the inherent contradictions between these groups and the unequal distribution of power that shapes their relationships.

The third assumption is that alliances can be sustained on the basis of morality, goodwill, or emotional appeals. Such a belief fails to account for the material and structural factors that ultimately determine the durability of political partnerships.

The first type of alliance illustrates a significant conceptual error. Proponents of such alliances advocate collaboration with parties that lack ideological coherence, often in the name of

achieving comprehensive social transformation. These groups, however, tend to accept the existing Caste dominant power structure and are willing to pursue only limited and incremental reforms. Such reforms are insufficient to dismantle the deeply rooted system of caste hierarchy and the arrogance associated with it.

A related issue is the pervasive influence of dominance within caste society. An individual belonging to the upper castes, regardless of their commitment to reform, cannot fully comprehend the realities of Bahujan life from within a Bahujan perspective. Their social existence—encompassing residence, education, and interpersonal relationships—remains situated within the framework of caste privilege. Even when they make deliberate efforts to understand Bahujan conditions, their insights often remain superficial. While they occupy positions of dominance within the caste order, Bahujans experience the same social world through marginalization, humiliation, and imposed inferiority. Bahujan Ideology therefore emphasizes that even well-intentioned individuals from dominant castes cannot entirely transcend the influence of caste dominance.

Participants in such alliances frequently fail to recognize Bahujans as equal partners. Instead, they tend to view their role as preserving established cultural and religious values, expecting others to conform to these norms. Although this perspective may not always manifest as explicit arrogance, it ultimately reinforces the continuation of caste dominance. Meaningful and effective Bahujan-centered alliances, therefore, require that all partners demonstrate a willingness to challenge prevailing social norms and institutional structures.

From the standpoint of Hindu nationalism, what is considered beneficial for the nation—often implicitly equated with the interests of upper castes—is also presumed to be beneficial for Bahujans. While broader nationalist discourse may claim to encompass all castes and religions within a single national identity, Hindu nationalism tends to privilege a narrower conception centered on Hindu identity. This perspective must be critically examined and resisted. Historically, from the period of the independence struggle to the present, the economic and social rights of Bahujans have been acknowledged only when they do not conflict with the interests of the ruling castes. When

such conflicts arise, these rights are frequently sidelined, remaining unresolved.

This dynamic is evident in the functioning of coalition governments aligned with Hindu nationalist ideology. Although these governments rely significantly on Bahujan electoral support, their policies often produce adverse outcomes for these communities. Legislative measures affecting agriculture, taxation policies that burden small and middle-class enterprises, and laws that disadvantage productive castes and minorities illustrate this trend. Additionally, large-scale public infrastructure projects—such as roads, airports, and ports—are frequently allocated in ways that benefit specific investors. The distribution of such projects, including through mechanisms like electoral bonds, underscores the prioritization of vested interests over public welfare. As a result, it becomes evident that as long as Bahujans remain dependent on a caste-dominant political framework, their interests will continue to occupy a secondary position.

A brief examination of a particular political party further illustrates these contradictions. While the party claims

adherence to certain ideological principles, it lacks a consistent framework guiding its alliances. At its inception, it invoked the image and ideas of Che Guevara, creating the impression of alignment with communist ideology. Subsequently, by associating itself with Mayawati, it projected an image of commitment to Bahujan politics. However, it later aligned with Hindu nationalist forces and, upon attaining power, declared the preservation of Sanatana Dharma as its primary objective. At various stages, it has presented different ideological positions, many of which appear disconnected from the concrete needs and aspirations of Bahujans.

Coalition governments aligned with Hindu nationalism tend to define objectives that serve their own interests and expect Bahujans to conform to these priorities. When Bahujan leaders attempt to advocate for the interests of their communities, they are often subjected to accusations of disloyalty or labeled as “anti-national.” Similarly, any political leader who challenges Hindu nationalism, capitalist structures, the Caste dominant power structure, or caste hierarchy is liable to be branded a traitor.

In sum, the question of alliances must be approached with careful scrutiny, recognizing the structural inequalities that shape political relationships and ensuring that the pursuit of power does not come at the cost of the fundamental interests and dignity of Bahujans.

From the standpoint of Bahujan Ideology, the theoretical foundations of trade unionism in India do not fundamentally challenge the structural nature of the economic system. Even organized labour movements have generally failed to recognize the necessity of questioning the underlying values and institutional frameworks of society. Trade unions have largely confined themselves to pursuing limited labour-centric objectives, thereby contributing to the formation of a working class that remains ideologically aligned with the foundational values of Hindu nationalism.

The demands of such labour groups are typically restricted to securing fair compensation for work and ensuring a degree of livelihood security. Their strategies—strikes, negotiations, and the articulation of demands—remain narrowly focused on immediate material concerns. Broader transformative objectives

are often neglected, with emphasis placed instead on day-to-day survival issues. While some invoke the experiences of public sector institutions established under socialist policies to argue for their transformative potential, the reality is that most trade unions function as affiliates of caste dominant political parties. Their activities are primarily directed toward addressing sectoral labour issues, rather than interrogating the caste system or the caste dominant power structure that sustains political, economic, and social inequalities. Communist movements, in this regard, have followed a similar trajectory. Although certain civil rights organizations have engaged with wider societal concerns, they too have not rigorously challenged the foundational basis of Casteism.

In essence, the improvement of the political, economic, and social conditions of the Bahujans requires a comprehensive reconstruction of the prevailing ideological order. The assumption that meaningful transformation can be achieved through alliances with Hindu nationalist forces is fundamentally flawed. Bahujans cannot establish effective alliances with groups that neither critically engage with injustice nor acknowledge the necessity of structural change. Within Bahujan

Ideology, it is untenable to assume that what benefits caste-dominant sections of society will necessarily benefit the Bahujan majority. Caste dominant power structures are actively sustained by caste dominant political parties, both directly and indirectly, often incorporating Bahujans into their framework in ways that perpetuate their own dominance. Consequently, Bahujans and their leadership must exercise vigilance in their political engagements with such entities.

A second category of alliances is based on the assumption that politically and economically secure groups can collaborate meaningfully with those that are insecure in these respects. However, by definition, the objectives of these groups diverge significantly, rendering such alliances inherently unstable. Empirical realities illustrate this imbalance clearly. In regions such as Uttar Pradesh, upper castes—predominantly landowning elites—form the core support base of dominant political formations, while landless Bahujans, subjected to historical exploitation, align with parties representing their interests. Under such conditions, the possibility of forming ideologically coherent alliances between these groups is highly questionable. Claims of harmonious cooperation in such contexts do not

withstand critical scrutiny. Rather, such arrangements often serve to advance the interests of dominant groups, reducing Bahujans to instrumental roles within political processes.

In southern India, similar patterns are observable, albeit in a different configuration. Alliances between ruling castes—comprising dominant caste, business, and landlord classes—and Bahujans continue to shape regional politics. However, these alliances are equally characterized by ideological contradictions. Parties representing ruling castes and landed interests possess structural advantages, and alliances with them tend to disadvantage Bahujans. For dominant groups, alliances function as strategic instruments; for weaker groups, they rarely provide enduring or equitable arrangements.

Historically, the caste system has operated by fragmenting Bahujan communities and fostering divisions among them. This fragmentation has facilitated the extraction of their labour and resources, while mutual antagonisms among Bahujans have reinforced upper-caste economic dominance. Thus, internal divisions within Bahujan communities continue to serve as a structural foundation for caste dominance.

In Andhra Pradesh, this dynamic is reflected in the distribution of economic and political power. Upper-caste groups, with control over land and commerce, constitute a dominant bloc, while Bahujans, lacking comparable access to resources, remain structurally disadvantaged. The current ruling coalition may be conceptualized as a three-part arrangement: one component representing dominant caste business interests, another representing landlord ruling castes, and a third representing the relatively weaker Bahujan section. However, this configuration is inherently imbalanced. The Bahujan component operates under the influence of the caste dominant power structure and landlord classes, limiting its capacity to safeguard its own interests. Its relative economic and political weakness, coupled with insufficient awareness of substantive developmental priorities, constrains its ability to represent Bahujan aspirations effectively. In this way, it inadvertently hinders the expansion of Bahujan Ideology.

The political and economic motivations driving upper castes and landlord ruling classes into such alliances are clearly discernible, as is the fact that these motivations often conflict directly with Bahujan interests. Bahujan leadership has

increasingly recognized the outcomes of such alliances, particularly in instances where Bahujans have extended consistent support to more secure coalition partners without commensurate benefits.

It is therefore essential to recognize that opportunistic alliances of this nature have not served the long-term interests of the Bahujans. The forces with which they align are frequently incompatible with their broader aspirations. In many instances, dominant groups engage in such alliances primarily to preserve their own power and status, often at the expense of obstructing Bahujan advancement.

A third category of alliances is based on the assumption that political cooperation can be sustained through moral considerations, emotional bonds, or personal goodwill. This assumption is equally untenable. Political relationships are fundamentally structured around self-interest, with decision-making driven by calculations of gain and loss. Political dynamics emerge from the negotiation and contestation of competing interests, rather than from ethical or emotional commitments.

When conflicts of interest arise, such alliances tend to dissolve, as their members cannot be relied upon as consistent or trustworthy partners. Moral appeals and emotional considerations are insufficient to resolve these contradictions. Consequently, no political group should base its strategic decisions on assumptions of goodwill. In the absence of enforceable mechanisms to ensure accountability, reliance on such factors exposes weaker groups to significant risk within alliance politics.

The central reality is that individuals conduct their lives by making practical decisions concerning their children's education, employment, housing, and long-term security. In a materialist social order that privileges profit and survival, there is limited scope for sustained engagement with ideological reflection. Consequently, one social group seldom assumes moral responsibility for the difficulties faced by another, even when proximity or shared context exists. When confronted with declining social respect, intensified competition in employment and business, reduced incomes, and diminishing asset values, alliances cannot endure solely on the foundations of morality, emotional bonds, or appeals to conscience.

Although the Constitution of India enshrines principles of equality, liberty, equal opportunity, and political, economic, and social justice, these guarantees have historically not been realized for the Bahujans. This contradiction arises from the continued dominance of the Caste dominant power structure, which has shaped governance and social relations in India from its inception to the present.

In this context, the question of stable alliances assumes critical importance. Before entering into any alliance, it is necessary to clearly define the ideological and strategic foundations upon which it rests. Each participating group must identify objectives that are mutually beneficial, grounded in a clear understanding of its own self-interest. It is analytically unsound to assume that what benefits one party will automatically benefit another. Accordingly, Bahujans must first determine their own priorities and interests, and only thereafter evaluate which groups are willing and capable of entering into meaningful cooperation. It is equally important to recognize that institutions and political formations operate primarily on the basis of self-interest and do not function according to an abstract moral conscience.

Furthermore, entry into an alliance must be preceded by the establishment of a tangible and independent base of power. In the absence of such a foundation, a group becomes dependent on the goodwill or moral inclinations of its allies, effectively reducing itself to a subordinate position that relies on patronage rather than partnership.

While short-term and issue-based alliances may, under certain circumstances, produce decisive outcomes, they generally lack the capacity to challenge the structural foundations of caste-based discrimination. Over time, such alliances may even prove counterproductive by obscuring fundamental conflicts of interest and confining weaker partners to limited and peripheral concerns. For alliances to be stable and effective, several essential conditions must be satisfied. Each party must possess a clear and explicit understanding of its own self-interest. There must be a rational basis to believe that the alliance will generate mutual benefit. Each party must maintain an independent base of power, avoiding reliance on external forces. Finally, the alliance must be structured around clearly defined and concrete objectives, rather than vague or aspirational goals.

It is also necessary to exercise caution in the formation of alliances between unequal partners. A weaker group should not align with a stronger one merely to oppose a third party, except under conditions of necessity, as such arrangements often result in the subordination of the weaker partner following the achievement of immediate objectives. Therefore, strategic efforts must be directed toward minimizing circumstances in which weaker groups are compelled to depend on stronger ones, as such alliances rarely yield substantial or lasting benefits for them.

Accordingly, Bahujans must prioritize internal organization, the consolidation of collective strength, and the articulation of clear goals before seeking alliances. Any group contemplating alliances must first establish itself as a coherent and organized force capable of independent action. Bahujan Ideology does not reject alliances as a matter of principle; rather, it rejects alliances that are constructed on illusions or unexamined assumptions. Alliances should be entered into only after attaining sufficient strength to engage on equal terms. Under such conditions, alliances can acquire stability and substantive meaning,

fostering mutual respect and reducing the likelihood of leadership betraying the interests of its constituents.

Thus, Bahujan Ideology does not advocate isolation; instead, it emphasizes the prior necessity of building independent strength, followed by engagement in alliances based on parity. Failure to adhere to this approach risks undermining even the limited gains achieved thus far, particularly in the face of opposing ideological forces. It is therefore incumbent upon Bahujans to construct durable foundations for their collective future. Finally, there is a clear need for Bahujans to redefine their social and political identity, articulating new values and objectives aligned with their long-term interests. This process of redefinition is not limited to Bahujans alone; it also extends to reform-oriented sections within the Dominant castes, who must critically reassess their own roles and responsibilities within the broader social order.

9. The Role of Reformists

Bahujan Ideology is frequently misconstrued as an attempt to exclude the upper castes from positions of leadership. This interpretation is incorrect. On the contrary, Bahujan Ideology recognizes a distinct and necessary role for reform-oriented representatives from the Dominant castes. This role may be understood across three interrelated dimensions: educational, organizational, and supportive.

In a society where Casteism is deeply entrenched, and where assumptions of caste superiority and Bahujan inferiority are widely internalized, it is essential that reformists from the Dominant castes begin by critically examining and eliminating such prejudices within themselves. Their engagement with Bahujans must not be rooted in paternalistic sympathy or charity, but in a principled commitment to justice and the empowerment of Bahujans. Given their access to social spaces that remain largely inaccessible to Bahujans, these reformists are uniquely positioned to intervene within upper-caste communities. They must utilize this access to promote

awareness of justice, challenge entrenched hierarchies, and educate members of their own communities.

A significant concern within Bahujan Ideology is that many reformists hesitate to confront Casteism within their own social environments. Those who undertake this responsibility constitute an important exception and merit recognition. It is necessary to distinguish such efforts from individual attempts by upper-caste actors to facilitate the “acceptance” of Bahujans within caste-dominant society. While such efforts may be well-intentioned and occasionally beneficial at an individual level, they are often premised on the untenable notion of integration into an inherently unequal structure.

Reformists have often emphasized nonviolence in their engagement with Bahujans. However, the imperative to uphold nonviolence must be directed primarily toward caste-dominant communities, where violence against Bahujans frequently originates. Reformists must therefore work within their own communities to promote ethical conduct, while simultaneously articulating the necessity of Bahujan empowerment and the principles of justice. Across the country, caste-dominant

societies continue to exhibit deficits in social awareness, humane values, and the capacity for equitable interaction with Bahujans. Addressing these deficiencies must form a central component of the reformist agenda.

The second dimension pertains to organizational engagement. In the long term, Bahujan Ideology envisions the possibility of an alliance between economically disadvantaged Bahujans and similarly situated members of the upper castes. Such an alliance is considered both acceptable and potentially transformative within the Indian context. At present, however, this remains largely a theoretical proposition. Realizing this possibility requires the development of an independent and progressive leadership among poor upper-caste groups—leadership that is not anchored in Casteism or hierarchical dependence. This responsibility rests primarily with reformist representatives from the Dominant castes who align with Bahujan Ideology.

Although there are opportunities for collaboration between Bahujans and upper castes, it must be acknowledged that sections of the economically disadvantaged upper castes have developed increasing antagonism toward Bahujans. This

sentiment is often driven by the perception that public attention disproportionately focuses on Bahujan deprivation, while neglecting the conditions of poor upper-caste groups. In reality, the fundamental issue lies in the persistent failure of state institutions to adequately address the legitimate demands of Bahujans. Consequently, Bahujans continue to struggle for equitable representation and access to resources in proportion to their population. Importantly, the structural conditions of poverty remain comparable across caste groups, even as their social contexts differ.

Recent measures such as EBC reservations, introduced under the auspices of the BJP, have been critiqued as inconsistent with the spirit of constitutional justice. In practice, these provisions have often benefited sections of the upper castes that are not among the most economically disadvantaged. By enabling access to such benefits through mechanisms that diverge from principles of equity, these policies risk disadvantaging both genuinely poor upper-caste groups and marginalized Bahujans. A more just framework must ensure that the needs of truly disadvantaged populations across all communities are addressed. The effective organization and mobilization of

economically disadvantaged segments within the Dominant castes is a task that can be most appropriately undertaken by members of those communities themselves. This necessitates the creation of new institutional forms and modes of political engagement. Reformist actors from the Dominant castes must therefore participate constructively in the broader process of Bahujan political transformation. Within this framework, Bahujan Ideology maintains that Bahujan organizations must remain under Bahujan leadership. Decision-making authority and organizational control must rest with Bahujans themselves. Reform-minded members of the upper castes may contribute in supportive capacities, particularly where they possess specialized knowledge or technical expertise.

It is also noteworthy that many reformist individuals from Dominant castes are drawn toward Bahujan causes due to a critical awareness of the limitations and contradictions inherent in caste-dominant social life. Their inability to reconcile with the casteist attitudes prevalent within their familial, educational, and social environments often motivates their engagement. Contrary to common assumptions, Dominant castes are not internally homogeneous; they are characterized by significant

internal divisions based on caste, sub-caste, and class. Across the country, there exist individuals from these backgrounds—including political actors and legal professionals—who actively support Bahujan movements and defend Bahujan rights. Their role, however, is not to assume leadership or define policy, but to facilitate dialogue, educate their communities, and assist in the organization of marginalized upper-caste groups.

In its practical orientation, Bahujan Ideology emphasizes the necessity of developing new political structures and institutional forms capable of addressing entrenched and long-standing social inequalities. The confrontation of entrenched power requires the construction of an independent and organized countervailing force. Accordingly, the primary task before Bahujans is the development of autonomous political strength. Only upon achieving such strength can alliances be formed on the basis of equality and mutual respect. Alliances that arise merely as instruments of survival within the paternalistic framework of the Caste dominant power structure are inherently limited; they lack the capacity to articulate or fulfill the substantive needs of Bahujans. For this reason, such alliances are rejected within the framework of Bahujan Ideology.

10. Core Beliefs of Bahujan Ideology

The Bahujan movement stands, at its heart, as a profound struggle for dignity—a reclamation of self-respect long denied. To dismantle the entrenched arrogance of the Caste dominant power structure, Bahujans must awaken to their latent political strength and collective will. Bahujan Ideology, therefore, does not merely speak; it educates, organizes, and inspires. It establishes dedicated political schools to awaken consciousness, to guide, and to unite Bahujans into a cohesive force.

Its central vision is clear and resolute: Bahujans must transcend the narrow enclosures of caste identities and gather instead under the expansive banner of a shared Bahujan consciousness. The pursuit of power is not an end in itself but a necessary path toward justice. While resistance against political, economic, and social injustices remains vital, the ultimate aim of Bahujan Ideology is not limited to the eradication of caste discrimination. It seeks something deeper—to awaken the people, to instill courage, and to lead them forward in their rightful quest for political power.

The systematic deprivation of Bahujan rights finds its roots in the Caste dominant power structure, which has, across generations, suppressed Bahujans in every sphere—political, economic, and social. It has erected barriers to their participation in governance and denied them their rightful place in the public sphere. The injustices that persist in India today bear silent testimony to this reality. Any honest examination of data reveals the same enduring truth.

In response, Bahujan Ideology calls for the creation of parallel political structures—foundations built from the ground up, especially in rural landscapes where the pulse of society beats strongest. It fortifies its arguments with legal reasoning, moral clarity, and real-time evidence. Time and again, the Caste dominant power structure reveals a harsh truth: that law, in practice, often becomes an instrument wielded by those in power. Without power, justice remains an unfulfilled promise, a distant echo.

Within Bahujan thought, politics is not a cynical contest for dominance; it is a disciplined, purposeful struggle for liberation. It is guided by enduring principles, shaped by collective

memory, and driven by an unwavering commitment to transform society.

- A. A revolution begins not with noise, but with awakening—when Bahujans claim the right to define their own future and chart their own destiny. This is the principle of Bahujan self-determination.

Through the long and winding river of Indian history, two currents have flowed side by side. One, visible and dominant, carries the weight of authority and control. The other, silent and submerged, gathers strength in the depths, waiting for its moment to rise. The Bahujan movement gives voice to this hidden current. It declares, with quiet conviction, that freedom is never bestowed—it is claimed. True liberation arises only when people assert their right to determine their own lives and stand firm in their pursuit of self-respect.

This principle rejects dependency and affirms that the essence of freedom lies in autonomy and dignity. In their journey toward self-respect, Bahujans must define their own goals, lead their own institutions, and sustain them

with unwavering commitment. They must move beyond fragmented caste loyalties and embrace a broader, unifying Bahujan identity.

Reliance on alliances that dilute strength must give way to self-reliance. The oppressed must take control of their own political, economic, and cultural institutions. Only then can self-governance transform from aspiration into reality.

- B. Revolution is not a fleeting event marked by sudden upheaval; it is a patient and enduring process, shaped through cadres, institutions, and political education. In this journey, organization must prevail over spontaneity. Emotion may ignite the spark, but only organization can sustain the flame.

Bahujan Ideology emphasizes disciplined, structured political effort. It recognizes a fundamental truth: the conscious bear a responsibility to awaken the unconscious. Those who have understood their condition must reach out to those still bound by inherited silence. While passion may initiate struggle, it is organized strength that ensures its

continuity. This enduring capacity is known as Bahujan organizational power.

The movement's strength is not accidental—it is built, brick by brick, through committed cadres, resilient institutions, and continuous political education. Revolution, in this understanding, is not a moment of eruption but a long journey of preparation. Without structure, even the most righteous anger fades into obscurity; with structure, even the faintest voice can reshape history.

This vision finds deep roots in the legacy of B. R. Ambedkar, who taught oppressed communities not only to resist but to build—to create institutions that endure beyond moments of protest. His emphasis on organization, representation, and collective action laid the groundwork for a sustained Bahujan movement.

Later, Kanshi Ram transformed these principles into a disciplined, systematic framework. He understood that numerical strength alone does not yield power; it must be organized, trained, and ideologically fortified. Through a

cadre-based approach, he ensured that every participant in the movement became an active agent of change.

Within Bahujan tradition, organization is valued above spontaneity. Sudden uprisings may shake the foundations of power, but only organized forces can reconstruct them. Hence, the movement invests deeply in political education—study circles, discussions, and ideological training. These are not mere intellectual exercises; they are crucibles where consciousness is shaped and sharpened.

The task of the conscious is not to command, but to awaken; not to dominate, but to illuminate. This work demands discipline, patience, and humility. It unfolds not through spectacle, but through persistent engagement—village assemblies, grassroots mobilization, and the quiet building of trust.

Each awakened individual becomes a pillar of the movement, strengthening its collective resolve. Thus, the organizational strength of the Bahujan movement is not merely structural—it is transformative. It turns scattered

individuals into a unified force, converts awareness into action, and sustains that action across generations.

In this enduring wisdom lies a simple yet powerful truth: revolutions that are organized endure, while those born of impulse fade away. The Bahujan movement, rooted in this understanding, teaches that true change is not sudden—it is cultivated, nurtured, and carried forward with steadfast resolve.

- C. Education transforms silent suffering into conscious resistance. Within Bahujan Ideology, political education is not merely a tool—it is a weapon of awakening. This profound truth was recognized by Jyotirao Phule, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, and Kanshi Ram. The foremost duty of a revolutionary is to make the revolution irresistible and unstoppable. A revolution that lacks clarity is fragile and easily defeated. Therefore, the Bahujan movement asserts that people must deeply understand the nature of caste dominance—its oppressive character, its Caste dominant power structure, and its enduring historical role.

In the Bahujan movement, political education is not an embellishment to struggle—it is its very spine. Where generations have endured humiliation in silence, education introduces a new cadence of life: the mind begins to question, the voice gathers courage to speak, and the feet learn to march with purpose. This transformation embodies the essence of Bahujan politics—the conversion of passive endurance into conscious, organized resistance stands at the heart of Bahujan Ideology.

The pioneers of this path—Jyotirao Phule, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, and Kanshi Ram—did not regard education as mere literacy or personal advancement. To them, education was a sharpened instrument against the entrenched system of caste dominance. Phule opened the doors of learning so that the oppressed could finally perceive the chains that bound them. Ambedkar, with his immortal call to “Educate, Organize, Agitate,” placed knowledge at the very foundation of liberation. Kanshi Ram transformed these insights into disciplined political organization, where collective consciousness became the bedrock of enduring strength.

Ambedkar warned that any revolution challenging the Caste dominant power structure inevitably invites counter-revolution. A revolution without clarity resembles a chariot without a charioteer—it may move, yet it cannot reach its destination. Thus, the Bahujan movement insists that the oppressed must comprehend not only their condition but also the structure that perpetuates their oppression. Political education equips individuals to read society with the same care and critical depth with which one studies a text—free from illusion and guided by reason.

It reveals that caste-based oppression is not a series of isolated injustices but a deliberate system designed to preserve Dominant castes and ruling castes. Injustice is neither accidental nor sporadic; it is structured, sustained, and reproduced with intent.

Political education further exposes the architecture of the Caste dominant power structure—its command over land, knowledge, governance, and cultural narratives. It demonstrates that power is maintained not only through

force but through deeply internalized consent, cultivated across generations.

Moreover, it situates caste within its historical continuum, enabling the Bahujan learner to understand how it has evolved, adapted, and continues to shape modern institutions. History, once written to glorify the few, is reclaimed to illuminate truth before the Bahujans.

In this process, education becomes both awakening and discipline. It does not merely inform—it transforms. It produces individuals who stand not on fleeting emotion but on firm understanding. Emotion may kindle the flame, but knowledge sustains it through the storms of struggle.

Thus, within the Bahujan tradition, political education is the forge where consciousness is shaped into power. It prevents the movement from drifting into confusion or dissolving into momentary anger. Rooted in knowledge, guided by history, and strengthened by leadership, it advances with unwavering purpose—until resistance itself becomes inevitable.

D. Bahujan Ideology calls upon Bahujans to rise as an independent political force. It firmly rejects superficial alliances, especially with dominant groups whose interests stand in opposition to those of the oppressed. To enter alliances without power is to step into a carefully laid trap; powerless alliances, in essence, become instruments of subjugation.

A fundamental principle emerges: a community seeking to exercise power within a broader society must first achieve unity within itself. Internal cohesion must precede external negotiation. Strength must be cultivated from within, and dialogue must arise from collective power—not from vulnerability. For this reason, Bahujan leadership has consistently upheld the primacy of independent political power.

For Bahujans, independent political power is not merely an organizational arrangement—it is the very foundation of self-respect. It is a quiet strength, forged through centuries of endurance. Power does not descend as charity; it must be built, preserved, and exercised with clarity and conviction.

Bahujan thought persistently warns against the illusion of convenient alliances. History bears witness to repeated betrayals—moments when the oppressed were invited into alliances, only to have their voices subdued within them. When those who control land, resources, authority, and dignity extend a hand, acceptance without critical reflection becomes a grave error. Without an independent base of power, such arrangements cease to be partnerships; they become absorptions—carefully constructed mechanisms of control.

In essence, when one lacks the strength to win independently and seeks alliance merely for limited gains, it is not a partnership but a surrender. Power, by its nature, respects power. A fragmented people—divided by caste, region, or transient interests—cannot negotiate their future with dignity.

Within Bahujan Ideology, unity is not a mere slogan—it is a disciplined practice. It involves not only the aggregation of numbers but the cultivation of shared consciousness, the alignment of collective purpose, and the creation of a

resilient political will that cannot be easily fragmented or redirected.

The teachings of Bahujan leaders echo across time: build strength before seeking alliances; establish an unignorable voice before entering negotiations. Only then can independent political power serve as a true vehicle for attaining authority.

When alliances are formed, they must arise from equality, not subordination. Negotiations must be rooted in self-respect, not desperation. Only a united and organized Bahujan force can safeguard the aspirations of the people and ensure that they are not diluted.

In this vision, political power is not the final destination—it is an instrument for the realization of justice. Justice, like a seed, requires fertile soil; that soil is the internal unity of Bahujans, cultivated with patience and guarded with vigilance. Unity must come first, followed by organization, and then independent assertion—only then can power be claimed, rather than borrowed.

E. Bahujan Ideology rests upon the firm foundation of scientific socialism—a doctrine shaped through long struggles, sustained by the endurance of the oppressed, and illuminated by the recognition that injustice knows no natural limits. Like a river that rises from distant hills and merges into the vast sea, the Bahujan movement springs from local suffering and finds its broader meaning within a global framework of scientific socialism.

At its core, Bahujan Ideology recognizes that the chains binding the oppressed are not isolated phenomena. The insights of Jyotirao Phule, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, and Kanshi Ram extended beyond immediate social reform; they envisioned a profound restructuring of society, wherein those who create economic value reclaim rightful power.

Accordingly, Bahujan mobilization embraces an anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist perspective. Capitalism, spanning continents, is understood not merely as an economic system but as a deeply entrenched global order, often marked by systemic inequity. Confronting such a

structure demands not fragmented resistance but unity grounded in shared material realities.

The struggles of Bahujans resonate with those of workers across Africa, Latin America, and other regions of the world. Though separated by language and geography, their voices converge upon a single truth: exploitation may assume different forms, but its essence remains unchanged. In this recognition, the Bahujan movement becomes part of a broader human struggle—a historical alliance with all who resist domination.

Bahujan Ideology aligns with the traditions of scientific socialism articulated by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, while reinterpreting them through the lived realities of caste, dignity, land, and social hierarchy. Where classical socialism emphasized class, Bahujan socialism extends the analysis by recognizing caste as a material and structural force intertwined with economic exploitation.

In this framework, freedom is not symbolic—it is material and tangible. It demands the redistribution of resources, the democratization of land, and the reorganization of

production in favor of Bahujans. Unity, therefore, is not merely an emotional appeal; it is a structural necessity. Without economic transformation, political power remains hollow; without unity, resistance dissipates into scattered efforts.

Thus, Bahujan Ideology stands both as a continuation and a renewal of scientific socialism. It advances the global struggle against imperialism and capitalism while enriching it with the specific truths of Bahujan experience. It affirms that no people can achieve liberation in isolation, and no system of exploitation can be dismantled in fragments. When the oppressed of the world recognize one another as companions in a shared struggle, the very foundations of injustice begin to tremble.

- F. The vision of an All-India Bahujan revolution rests upon a profound recognition: that unity and economic transformation must advance together if power is to be meaningfully attained. Political freedom, when severed from economic control, becomes but a fragile illusion—an empty shell of independence. Bahujan Ideology

underscores this truth with unwavering clarity. It affirms that the unity of the Bahujans alone constitutes genuine Pan-Indianism. As its economic pathway, it embraces Scientific Socialism, holding firmly to the conviction that this alone possesses the transformative capacity to liberate both India and its Bahujan masses.

Thus, it becomes imperative for Bahujans to internalize both All-India Bahujan Ideology and the socialist perspective. The Bahujan movement makes a resolute declaration: power is not bestowed through benevolence; it must be consciously constructed. It is first forged within the minds of the people, then shaped through collective organization, and ultimately established within the structures of governance.

In the Bahujan imagination, All-India Bahujanism is not the hollow construct of upper-caste nationalism; it is a living, breathing unity that transcends regions, languages, castes, religions, and classes. The struggles of a farmer in Punjab, a Dalit laborer in Tamil Nadu, an Adivasi in Central India, and a backward caste weaver in Andhra are not disparate

tales—they are interwoven chapters of a single, unfinished history. To recognize this shared destiny is to take the first decisive step toward a Bahujan revolution. When these silenced voices rise together, they transform from isolated cries into a collective force capable of reshaping the nation's future.

Yet unity alone cannot sustain liberation. History bears witness that political authority without economic control is akin to a lamp without oil—its glow is fleeting, its promise short-lived. True freedom must permeate the fields and factories, the markets and institutions of wealth. Land, labor, natural resources, dignity, and power must cease to be the privilege of a few and become the rightful inheritance of the Bahujans.

It is here that the socialist perspective emerges—not as a foreign imposition, but as a natural extension of India's enduring traditions of collective labor and shared existence. Bahujan Ideology adopts Scientific Socialism as its economic compass, envisioning it as a means to eradicate exploitation and to reorganize society upon the enduring

principles of equality, production, and justice. Just as Bahujan Ideology unveils the mechanisms of power embedded in caste and hierarchy, Scientific Socialism reveals the workings of power through capital and economic control. Together, they form a comprehensive vision—one that illuminates both the chains of oppression and the forces that forged them, not only to the Bahujans but also to the impoverished among the dominant castes.

The All-India Bahujan revolution, therefore, is not merely a quest to capture the state; it is a mission to resolve its deepest contradictions and to ensure equitable progress for all. It seeks to replace domination with dignity, exclusion with participation, and accumulation with just distribution.

G. Within Bahujan Ideology, discipline, sacrifice, and commitment stand as foundational virtues. The lives of Jyotirao Phule, B. R. Ambedkar, and Kanshi Ram serve as enduring guides, illuminating the moral and personal transformation required of Bahujan leadership. At its heart lies a profound principle: the Bahujan leader is guided by

love—not a passive or sentimental affection, but a resolute and selfless devotion to the people.

The moral foundation of the Bahujan movement rests upon four timeless pillars—love, discipline, sacrifice, and commitment. These are not abstract virtues; they are the living essence of the movement, shaping both its character and its aspirations.

Love as the wellspring of transformation
For Phule, Ambedkar, and Kanshi Ram, love was never a quiet emotion; it was a dynamic force of change. A Bahujan leader must be rooted in a deep and almost sacred compassion for the oppressed. This love is not charity, nor is it softness—it is a profound identification with the suffering and hopes of the people. Ambedkar’s life stands as a testament to this truth: a relentless struggle not for personal advancement, but for the upliftment of the most marginalized. Such love demands courage—it sustains conviction even in moments of solitude and adversity.

Discipline as the architecture of struggle
If love ignites the flame, discipline gives it form and

direction. Organization, clarity, and restraint are indispensable. The Bahujan movement demonstrates that centuries-old structures of dominance cannot be dismantled through unrestrained emotion alone. Kanshi Ram consistently emphasized disciplined, cadre-based organization, reminding activists that power is not seized in haste but patiently built through sustained effort. History teaches that revolutions without discipline may shine brightly for a moment, yet it is disciplined movements that endure and transform society.

Sacrifice as the price of progress
Every step forward in the history of the oppressed has been purchased with sacrifice. From Phule's courageous establishment of schools amidst fierce opposition to Ambedkar's renunciation of personal comfort for intellectual and political struggle, the Bahujan tradition is steeped in acts of selflessness. Sacrifice here is not mere suffering; it is the conscious elevation of collective liberation above personal gain. It requires the strength to endure isolation, hardship, and resistance for a greater

cause. Without sacrifice, commitment loses its substance and becomes mere rhetoric.

Commitment as the continuity of the movement
Movements are not fleeting—they are long journeys that span generations. Commitment ensures that the flame of transformation does not wane. Bahujan Ideology demands unwavering dedication, not as a temporary engagement but as a lifelong calling. Kanshi Ram exemplified this through his tireless efforts in building institutions and nurturing political consciousness. He reminded followers that true dedication requires not fragments of time, but the offering of one's entire life to the cause.

Together, these four principles shape the ideal Bahujan leader—not one driven by personal ambition, but one forged in collective purpose. Ambedkar's enduring warning echoes here: a just society cannot be built by unjust individuals. Thus, the Bahujan leader emerges not merely as a political actor, but as a moral force—guided by love, structured by discipline, strengthened by sacrifice, and sustained by unwavering commitment.

H. Bahujan Ideology does not stand in opposition to Indian nationalism or the ideal of unity. Yet it firmly rejects any invocation of these ideals as a mask for control, oppression, or exploitation. It refuses to tolerate any attempt to weaken or dismantle the Bahujan movement under the guise of unity. Central to its philosophy is the rejection of nominal integration—the belief that mere inclusion within an unjust system constitutes liberation.

B. R. Ambedkar and Kanshi Ram critically challenged the notion of liberal integrationism in politics. They recognized it as a subtle mechanism designed to preserve upper-caste dominance. Revolutionary politics, in this understanding, does not seek entry into power for its own sake; it seeks to transform the very nature of power.

Through its long and arduous journey, the Bahujan movement has learned to distinguish between the appearance of power and its true substance. It refuses symbolic gestures that leave the roots of inequality untouched. To reject nominal integration is not an act of defiance alone—it is a reasoned and principled stance.

Inclusion within an unjust system does not equate to empowerment; it often serves to contain and neutralize resistance. A position within a structure where rules are preordained against the oppressed does not confer power—it refines domination.

Ambedkar cautioned against this illusion, describing political democracy without social and economic democracy as a “house built on sand.” His critique was not directed at participation itself, but at participation devoid of transformation.

Kanshi Ram extended this insight into the realm of modern politics, exposing how dominant systems selectively incorporate a few individuals from oppressed communities—granting them positions and recognition—while leaving the underlying structures unchanged. Such gestures of inclusion function not as instruments of justice, but as mechanisms of stabilization. They suppress dissent while preserving the status quo. Representation becomes a mask, and integration a carefully crafted illusion.

Bahujan Ideology, therefore, rejects the liberal promise that gradual integration will yield equality. It recognizes such processes as subtle strategies that isolate individuals, elevate exceptions, and weaken collective struggle. In doing so, they fracture unity and reinforce the misconception that the system is inherently just.

Rooted in the teachings of Phule, Ambedkar, and Kanshi Ram, the Bahujan perspective calls not for entry into oppressive institutions, but for their fundamental reconstruction. It envisions a society where dignity is not granted as a concession, but established as an unshakable foundation. Accordingly, Bahujan politics prioritizes independent organization, ideological clarity, and collective strength—ensuring that participation arises from empowerment, not submission.

In this tradition, revolutionary politics does not plead for inclusion; it questions the very foundations of the system: Who defines power? Who benefits from it? And how may it be restructured to serve the Bahujans? Its aim is not to

adorn an old structure, but to rebuild it upon principles of justice and equality.

Like an ancient river that gathers strength from countless tributaries, Bahujan thought flows steadily toward deep and enduring transformation—resilient, purposeful, and destined to reshape the social landscape.

Here is the translated content rewritten in formal English with emotive expression, adhering to your specified terminology.

- I. Bahujan Ideology does not seek caste-dominant leadership; it yearns for collective participation. It believes with profound conviction that revolution must be born from the lived realities of the people, and that the people alone are the true architects of history. In this spirit, Bahujan leadership awakens the Bahujans and tirelessly cultivates a lasting Bahujan consciousness. Once awakened, the people are mobilized and organized. For an ideology to endure, it must not merely orchestrate fleeting crowds like the meetings of today's political parties. This is precisely why Phule, Ambedkar, and Kanshiram placed their faith in

grassroots mobilization. Within the Bahujan movement, collective leadership is no mere strategy—it is a matter of deep respect, living memory, and an unshakable philosophy. Jyotirao Phule, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, and Kanshiram never saw leadership as an exclusive privilege for a chosen few, nor as an ornamental decoration granted by a power hierarchy. They envisioned it as a shared and sacred purpose—leadership that is born in countless fields, factories, slums, schools, marketplaces, salt marshes, the villages of the rural poor, and the isolated hamlets of the outcast; there, through struggle, it draws its very breath. In their vision, leadership is never imported from above; it sprouts from the fertile soil of lived experience and the unyielding pursuit of justice. Therefore, Bahujan Ideology rejects with absolute clarity the notion that liberation can be achieved under the leadership of dominant castes. Such leadership, however pure its language may sound, remains cruelly distant from the wounds and the soaring aspirations of the oppressed. Instead, this movement insists with fierce hope that those who have endured the sting of exploitation must themselves become the architects of transformation. The oppressed are not merely actors upon history's stage—

they are the ones who write history itself. In this profound sense, collective leadership is a continuous awakening. It calls upon every Bahujan leader to become a jagruta chetana—a living flame of political awareness. Leadership must never be locked within a single individual; it must spread across society like lamps kindled from one another. When consciousness spreads, organizational structure takes shape; when that structure grows strong, power sinks its roots deep into the ground. This is why the Bahujan movement is never confined to intermittent meetings or symbolic gatherings. It does not simply rally crowds and then scatter them back into silence. On the contrary, it strives to build permanent structures of consciousness—disciplined cadres marching forward, communities bound by a shared destiny, and institutions that mirror the collective will of the Bahujans. By rejecting caste dominance, the Bahujan movement also rejects a culture of subservience. It does not wait for saviors from above; it builds collectives. It builds collective power. In Bahujan thought, the leader is no distant, transcendent figure—the leader dwells among the people, listening, learning, and guiding without ever dominating. Thus, collective

leadership is the very spine of the Bahujan movement: strong, inclusive, and profoundly democratic. It is a leadership that does not decay with individuals, because it lives within the people themselves. When the people—not as scattered fragments but as a united, awakened force—rise, they do not merely participate in history; they reshape its very course.

- J. Bahujan theory teaches with urgent insistence that clarity about contradictions is essential. Bahujan Ideology warns us with solemn gravity: we must know who stands with the Bahujans and who stands against them. Clarity in contradiction is the compass for any revolutionary movement. On the long, tumultuous journey of the Bahujan struggle, this clarity draws the line between awakening and illusion, between genuine power and hollow participation. In politics, all alliances are forged upon self-interest. Ambedkar and Kanshiram warned us never to mistake friends for enemies. Dr. B.R. Ambedkar reminded us that politics is not an arena of raw emotion but of organized, calculating interests. Kanshiram brought this hard truth to life. He warned that alliances in politics are rarely born of affection; they are hammered into shape in the furnace of

necessity and self-interest. To forget this, they believed, is to walk blindfolded into the conspiracies of those who have ruled and oppressed for generations. "In politics, all alliances are based on self-interest." This is a bitter, unforgiving truth. Bahujan Ideology insists with fierce resolve that the oppressed must learn to examine power not as it pretends to appear, but as it truly is—deep, raw, and unvarnished. Ruling classes often offer symbolic gestures of inclusion toward Bahujans, but behind those gestures lurk dark intentions: to dilute, divide, or crush the very existence of Bahujan power. Therefore, the Bahujan movement teaches from its painful experience that not every outstretched hand is a hand of friendship. Hence, the primary duty is to distinguish between primary contradictions and secondary contradictions. The primary contradiction stands between the Bahujan people and the systems of caste, class, and social hierarchy that deny them dignity and power. Secondary contradictions arise within oppressed groups themselves, or with forces that—even when temporarily allied—lack any fundamental commitment to Bahujan liberation. Without clarity, we risk the tragic error of mistaking temporary allies for permanent

comrades—or, worse still, mistaking enemies for friends. This is what we call a political method: organizing independently, building internal strength, and engaging with others from a position of clear-eyed power. In truth, a powerless coalition is not unity—it is surrender wearing a disguise. Therefore, Bahujan Ideology demands a vigilant, unblinking consciousness. Consciousness asks the hard questions: Who truly benefits? Who really leads? Who ultimately decides? It judges those who claim to stand with Bahujans not by their polished words, but by their tangible connection to the material and political interests of the oppressed. Those who oppose Bahujans, even when draped in the garments of reform, work quietly to preserve the old order. Clarity about contradictions is not merely an intellectual exercise—it is a law of survival. Because only when Bahujans can clearly name their friends and their enemies—united, resolute, and unafraid—can they march forward toward the horizon of dignity, equality, and genuine power.

- K. Furthermore, several other vital core beliefs of Bahujan Ideology are set forth below. Bahujan Ideology is a stirring call for the Bahujans of this nation to unite, to reclaim their

stolen heritage, to set their own destiny, and to achieve political, economic, and social justice. The Bahujan revolution begins first in the minds and hearts of the Bahujans. This we call Bahujan political consciousness. Bahujans must understand their condition—who crushes them, and how power truly operates. Without this clarity, rebellion becomes nothing but a directionless roar. In Bahujan Ideology, unity and collective identity play a central, non-negotiable role. Bahujans must first stand as one. The social, cultural, and political unity of the Bahujans is the very foundation of power. It is a bedrock belief of Bahujan community that divided voices have never changed history. For the Bahujan movement, revolution is not mere protest—it is a fierce struggle for the transfer of power. Bahujans must seize control over political, economic, and social systems; only then will their future rest securely in their own hands. Self-determination is a sacred pillar of the Bahujan movement. Bahujans must define themselves—not through the degrading lens of caste oppression, but through their own magnificent history, their own culture, their own blazing aspirations. Only then does Bahujan dignity become a living, breathing reality. Mass

participation is the lifeblood of the Bahujan movement. The Bahujan revolution is not the work of a few leaders alone. Bahujan workers, students, peasants, employees—every single one must become a participant in the movement for change. A revolution without the people is merely reform handed down from above by upper castes. Economic transformation stands at the very heart of the Bahujan movement. The Bahujan movement fights not only for political change through power transfer, but for a radical transformation in the economic condition of Bahujans. The goal of Bahujan Ideology is to reshape the economy so that wealth and resources serve all the people, not just a greedy few. Discipline and organization are the unyielding pillars of the Bahujan movement. The goal of the Bahujan revolution is not chaos or mindless disorder, but to mobilize with strategy, iron discipline, and organized strength. Cultural liberation is an inseparable part of the Bahujan movement. The Bahujan movement sees language, history, and culture as battlegrounds of struggle. By nurturing Bahujan self-respect in their own language, history, and traditions, the Bahujan movement wages a courageous war against oppressive castes. All Bahujans must unite...

organize themselves, and build a powerful, unshakeable political foundation. What Bahujans need is power—the raw, real power to determine the future of Bahujan societies. Bahujans must write their own future with their own hands, not inherit it as a curse. Bahujans must redefine themselves, and only Bahujans can perform this sacred act of redefinition... Bahujans must cast aside the shame that previous generations fell victim to the caste system. Future generations must awaken, so that they never again fall prey to the monstrous demon of caste.

The author, Dr. Marlapudi Vijay Chandra, is a Rahulian and actively engaged researcher of Indian National Congress Party.

In this commentary, he has unveiled the inner essence of the Bahujan movement.

Through this work, he clearly states that without overcoming the fundamental problems of caste discrimination and the caste-based dominant power structure, it is impossible to establish a society without inequalities.

He eloquently discusses how capitalism suppresses the Bahujan community, the role of the ruling castes,

He eloquently discusses how capitalism suppresses the Bahujan community, the role of the ruling castes,

He also reflects on how leaders with Bahujan identity should think and act.

The foundational principles of Bahujan ideology are beautifully articulated.

This commentary will be highly useful for Bahujan leaders, researchers, and political parties leaders.

Publisher



RROSHAN
Publications

Visakhapatnam

E-mail: roshanpublications@gmail.com

Mobile : 9493159482